Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 108, NO. 16 NEW YORK, MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1943 NUMBER 1481

Tunisia

Things have been going well in Tunisia. At the beginning of this week there was no doubt that the retreating Rommel was in serious difficulties and that these difficulties were likely to grow worse. Army spokesmen were revising downward their estimates of the length of time required for the complete seizure of Tunisia, from perhaps three months to very much less. This does not mean, however, that an invasion of Europe by way of the Mediterranean basin would automatically follow in June or July. To be sure, we might strike in Norway, France or Greece, or several of these points at once, without waiting for the African struggle to be liquidated. But as for the Mediterranean itself there are Axis installations on numerous islands which must be cleared out before shipping is reasonably safe; and this is a hard job—as hard as the corresponding island-hopping in the Southwestern Pacific. Some experts believe that even if Rommel's African adventure is ended by June 1, it may be October before we can strike at Italy or the Mediterranean coast of France.

In the meantime, the transportation situation was enormously bettered with the historic meeting of British and American troops in Tunisia. Supplies for Montgomery from Britain or America no longer need to go around the Cape of Good Hope to Cairo and then westward across the desert. They can now go overland—a far shorter distance—from French North Africa. Conversely, gasoline refined in the Near East can now come by ship to Tripoli, for example, and this will cut down the amount that needs to be sent across the Atlantic. When the Mediterranean is entirely open again, these advantages will be greatly enhanced—and incidentally, the gasoline famine in the Eastern United States much reduced.

Time Needed

Impatient Americans need to remind themselves constantly that the North African affair is only a curtain-raiser to the big show. Germany must be conquered in Europe, and this will probably be a long and bloody business. Thereafter, Japan must be conquered in her own islands, and this also is likely to take much time and effort.

Critics of our general strategy keep telling us that we should strike at once, that time is not on our side, that the longer we give the enemy to entrench himself, the more nearly invincible he becomes. That it is better to attack soon than late is so obvious that no one should waste breath saying it; but the rejoinder is, attack with what? It is quite true that military history is full of instances of generals who for one reason or another postponed fighting far longer than they needed to. It is also true that if you are sufficiently timid, you can always argue plausibly that you are not yet prepared. But there is no reliable evidence that this is the case with the British and Americans at present.

We keep forgetting that Hitler and the Japanese bent every effort to get ready for war for six years prior to 1939. Great Britain on the other hand had to improvise almost everything except her navy, beginning after Dunkirk; and the United States did not get into full stride until after Pearl Harbor. It would be a miracle if we were now ready to launch full-scale offensives in Europe and Asia, and miracles don't happen. It is

CONTENTS

The Week 491

Editorials

The President Holds the Line 495
Doctors in Wartime (Cont'd) 495
Freight Rates in the South 496
Appeasing the Farm Bloc 497

General Articles

On the Fear of Russia . . . Bernard Pares 498
Will It Be a Fourth Term? . Carroll Kilpatrick 502
Salvaging the Ships . . Sally Lee Woodall 505
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 507
The Trouble with Movies . Manny Farber 508
Oklahoma with Details . . . Stark Young 508
The Bandwagon 509

Correspondence 510

Books in Review

Last Man Around the World . Malcolm Cowley 513
A Woman Doctor's Odyssey . Frances Perkins 514
Parkman and Literature . . . . . Howard N. Doughty Jr. 514
Man of Magic . . . . Henry Lee Moon 515
John Cheever's Stories . . . Weldon Kees 516
A Reader's List 517

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important that we should not delay a moment in carrying the war to the enemy at the earliest possible time; but it is even more important that we should not attack without being strong enough to have a reasonable chance of victory.

Who Will Plan for Jobs?

The work of the National Resources Planning Board, which forms the basis for the special section with this number, "Charter for America," would be terminated if the House of Representatives had its way. The House declined to vote an appropriation for the board some weeks ago. The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, seems to be regarding the board with more favor and may throw the subject back into conference. The fact that the action of the House took place before the publication of the reports on Social Security and Post-War Planning, while the Senate committee's reconsideration followed their publication, means something about the popular response to the subject.

It will be seen by readers of this week's special section of The New Republic that, important as the contribution of the board is, much work remains to be done if a detailed program is to be ready in time. If the NRPB does not do it, some other agency must, unless the peace is to be lost at home. Planning must be done, if not under one name, then under another. Congress ought to be critically examining the NRPB, not because it has attempted to plan on a large scale, but to discover whether it has done so early enough and whether the execution of its function could not be improved.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements in Danger

It would be a calamity if the anti-administration majority in Congress should fail to renew the grant of power to the State Department to make reciprocal trade agreements. This power has now been held ever since Mr. Roosevelt's first term, and has been wisely exercised, to the great advantage of all concerned. The reason for it is the same as ever—that when tariff revision is thrown into Congress it usually takes a long time and, through the process of log-rolling, results in increases in rates rather than the decreases which make for world trade and prosperity.

At present there is a further and overwhelming argument against change. Repeal or substantial modification of the principle would mean to the rest of the world that the United States was in process of returning to isolationism at the very moment when the fighting of the war and the winning of the peace demand greater international unity, both political and economic. Reciprocal trade agreements are far from an adequate implementation of the economic aims of the United Nations, but if the power to make them were ended they would become a symbol of defeat.

Happy Birthday

With fanfare like that given the launching of a new deodorant or a Hollywood starlet, the press prepared us for the two-hundredth anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. Skimming the surface of the torrent of news releases, editorials, feature articles and essays by historians and school children, we found most of it as banal and pointless as the copy of the average advertising campaign. It does not detract from the astonishing versatility of Jefferson to point out that, like the Bible and the writings of Emerson, his work provides text and sermon for an enormous variety of social and political points of view. Historical developments rather than any inner contradictions in his thought have robbed many of his doctrines of their specific content, and he has become the intellectual hitching-post alike for Communists and reactionary "Jeffersonian" Democrats, for populists and budget-slashers. His *obiter dicta* have been made much of for a variety of reasons, most commonly to oppose a third (or a fourth) term for the President, and the other day it was discovered that he had invented the "pay-as-you-go" plan of taxation. We have no doubt that in due time it will be found that Jefferson foreshadowed electronics, a non-collapsible paper container for hot coffee, and native American national socialism. On the morning after the revolution his statue will be raised in every public park and editorials celebrating his contemporaneity will flow from all the presses. Then as now we shall try to remember the simple truths of popular democratic government which Thomas Jefferson in his life and thought expressed best of all the remarkable figures of his revolutionary era.

Southern Liberals

A group numbering about a hundred well meaning Southern white leaders met last week in Atlanta to formulate a liberal position on the race question. They issued a statement calling for "a positive program of understanding, coöperation and mutual respect." A committee was provided for, to meet with the Southern Negroes who a little earlier had met in Durham and issued an excellent statement on the subject of the Negro's wartime goals. The Atlantic group furthermore expressed a desire to aid the Negro's economic, political and educational improvement. However, when the statement was reduced to fundamentals, its Jim Crow pattern stood forth, for it clung to the traditional concept of "mutual respect" between the races: the maintenance of compulsory segregation. Segregation laws are justified, the statement said, falling back into the old hypocrisy, because "they are intended to minister to the welfare and the integrity of both races."

Segregation has made possible the greatest injuries to the Negro people, and more than any other one technique has prevented their welfare. When the white

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people segregate the Negro people, it is on the premise that they are inferior, regardless of phrases like "welfare and integrity"; when the white people give the weight of the law to this racial prejudice, they make possible—in fact inevitable—the legal system of discrimination against all Negroes which keeps them in poverty, ignorance and economic serfdom. Lynchings and police brutality are made possible by segregation. All of the injustices which these Southerners deplore—for they are moved by genuine, though confused, humanitarian sentiments—grow out of the system of segregation which they insist on maintaining.

The Day Will Come

No doubt it is expecting too much to ask for abstract and scientific justice and an end of race hypocrisy in the South today—or anywhere else in the nation. This will come in time; centuries sooner than most complacent white people think, but not tomorrow nor next year. In the meantime, meetings like the Atlanta conference will do much good and prepare the way for better things to come. Although the liberals who formed its membership are not liberal on the very fundamental issue of Negro segregation, they at least met in the name of liberalism, and their statement adopted a sympathetic attitude toward the Negro people. This is of great value to Southern Negroes in a time when villainous politicians and plain stupid people are fanning wartime restlessness into race hate.

Vicksburg and Washington

An ugly instance of anti-union violence recently took place in Vicksburg, Mississippi. The Anderson-Tully Lumber Company, of that city, has 1,200 employees, 90 percent of them Negroes. The CIO has been trying to organize them, and sent two men to do this work, Claud Welch, a white man, and Frank Davis, a Negro. Their efforts were sufficiently successful to cause the NLRB to order an election early this month in the plant.

About this time, according to a sworn affidavit by Davis, he was pointed out to city police on the street by one Hattaway, the mill superintendent. He was taken to the city jail and kept there twenty-four hours, without any food, and without any formal charges being made against him. At the end of that time, he heard someone at the rear of the police station say, "I'm ready for your CIO man." The chief of police then took Davis from his cell and pushed him out the back door, where three armed men were waiting for him. They slugged him and handcuffed him, threw him face down on the floor of a car, and took him out into the country. Here he was handcuffed to a tree and the three men took turns beating him with weighted rubber hose, meanwhile asking him about his work for the CIO and threatening to kill him if he ever came back to Vicksburg. After a heavy beating, he was put back in the car, driven to another place, flogged again and finally released and told to run for his life. Shots were fired after him. Davis was so badly beaten that he required hospitalization in Memphis.

Uncle Sam Is Interested

The experience of Welch was practically similar. He was decoyed out of his lodging house by word sent in that Frank Davis wanted to see him. According to his sworn statement, a man named Lum, chief guard of the lumber company, then stuck a revolver into his face and forced him into a car driven by a deputy sheriff named Lucket. Several other men were in the party, one of them the brother of the mill superintendent, Hattaway. Welch, also, was taken into the country, handcuffed to a tree and beaten to the accompaniment of a stream of obscene abuse by Lum. He, like Davis, was threatened with death if he stayed in Vicksburg. He was finally set free.

Until very recently, this story would have ended here. No punishment would have been given to those guilty of these brutal attacks. Now, however, the case is different. As Helen Fuller pointed out in The New Republic of February 15, the courts have recently interpreted the federal Constitution so as to bring in the Department of Justice in cases like this. The Southern Workers' Defense League, of Atlanta, investigated the case and its secretary, Frank McCallister, brought it to the attention of the Civil Liberties Unit of the Department of Justice. It looks as though the people who beat Welch and Davis may be in trouble. We hope so.

A Statement for General Hershey

Director Hershey of the Selective Service System has issued another statement about the draft, and especially farm workers and fathers. Farm workers are to be deferred from military service henceforth; fathers are deferred for a while if their children were conceived before Pearl Harbor. We very much hope that this will be the last public announcement by General Hershey for a long time to come. Indeed, we have been hoping that he would issue a statement to the newspapers solemnly declaring that he will issue no more statements to the newspapers. The incessant changes in the draft, dark hints of changes and repudiations of dark hints have done more than almost anything else to hurt the country's morale.

We realize that General Hershey is in a pretty tough spot, with the army on one side of him, Congress on the other and the farmers attacking with pitchforks from the rear. We also realize that army requirements change from month to month, throwing his plans out of kilter; and since those requirements are a military secret, the General has to accept public responsibility. This helps to explain his conflicting statements, but it does not make their effect any less

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confusing to the public. England has managed to get along without them for nearly four years, while drafting millions of her smaller population. In America, the only safe and necessary statement about the operation of the Selective Service Act is that, during this total war, anybody not an idiot or a cripple may be called upon and should be ready at any time to serve his country.

Bombing Civilians in Europe

Two respected British papers, The New Statesman and The Tribune, have both printed articles dealing with American daylight bombing of European objectives. This bombing is necessarily done from great heights, and these two British papers say that large numbers of innocent civilians are being killed. They question whether such bombing may not alienate sympathies of so many Europeans that its military value is offset by the harm that it does. At the same time, in British clerical circles, a movement has developed urging that bombing of all European cities be abandoned because of the damage that is done to civilians.

This is a difficult and complicated problem. There is evidence that Hitler is beginning to be badly hurt by the bombing raids, and has started a propaganda campaign to have them stopped on humanitarian grounds. The New Statesman and The Tribune certainly would not lend themselves to such a campaign, but it is possible that they may have been misled. The impression among Americans has been that high-level bombings from our planes is not wildly inaccurate, as these papers claim. Certainly the results on ships at sea do not support this theory. The bombing has been going on for some time now and no word of these protests from European civilians has reached America directly, so far as we know. Here is clearly a subject where more information is needed before final judgments are formed.

The Plot Against the Kerr Committee

Congress this year, while it voted a new appropriation for the Dies Committee, also started an activity which in the long run might prove fatal to the pretty little Dies plan of stabbing in the back as many liberals as possible and hurting the New Deal in every conceivable way. Dies had made sensational charges against some thirty-eight federal employees. The House, no doubt remembering reports by the Department of Justice that only a tiny minority of the previous Dies victims were found on fair investigation to be guilty of radicalism, set up a special subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, under the chairmanship of Rep. John H. Kerr. The job of this subcommittee is to investigate the Dies charges against the thirty-eight.

That was two months ago, and the other day the House returned to the subject. Rep. Everett Dirksen complained that nothing had been done by the new committee during this interval and pulled a long face about all the chances he had lost in the meantime to bar people from government service by riders to appropriation bills. Rep. Clare Hoffman admitted that his nose was out of joint because he hadn't been asked to join the Kerr Committee. Dies himself, naturally, threw rocks at the new group.

The New Line

Evidently this is a new and important line of the Dies Committee; it has already had backing from the McCormick-Patterson axis. They are trying to destroy the Kerr Committee before it has had a chance to do its work. It is true that this committee has been somewhat slow; for one thing, it has had trouble in getting a prompt response from the Dies Committee and from other groups asked for the records of the thirty-eight accused men. For another, it is doing something unheard of in Washington lately, and especially from the Dies Committee—it is following Anglo-Saxon principles of fair play, and giving every accused man a chance to be heard. Such a man also gets, reasonably far in advance, a written statement of the charges against him, so that he can prepare a reply. Giving an accused individual a chance to defend himself is obviously a complete and startling innovation to Mr. Dies, though some of the members of his committee have evidently been impressed by it and are beginning to feel they should follow suit.

The plot to destroy the Kerr Committee is, luckily, so clumsy and so obvious that it should defeat its own ends. Certainly lovers of fair play will hope so.

Bureaucratic Reply

In a recent speech in the House and an indignant press release, Rep. Karl Mundt of South Dakota declared that the Indian Service of the Department of the Interior is expensive, wasteful and productive only of bureaucratic regulation of Indian life. In a statement to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, provided some figures bearing on this charge. If Congress grants the appropriation asked, the Indian Service will cost $69 per Indian for the coming year. This will furnish all those services which whites got from local, state and federal governments in 1941 at a cost of $182.79 per capita (plus the cost of private charities).

Representative Mundt said that $100 a year per capita is spent in "regulating" the Indians. The correct figure is $11.60 per Indian—60 cents on law and order and $11 on administering all Indian property. The sum asked for the Indian Service for next year is in fact too small, although this bureau does wonders on its appropriations—as, for example, cutting the Indian death rate in the past sixteen years from 27 per 1,000 to 13.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Freedom for Puerto Rico

If a majority of people of Puerto Rico, after full consideration of all the facts, want to sever every tie with the United States, they ought to be allowed to do so. We strongly doubt, however, that any Puerto Rican majority is likely to express such a decision. Times have changed in recent years, especially for small countries; full independence no longer seems the complete paradise it once did.

Meanwhile, there remains the immediate question of an elected rather than an appointed governor for Puerto Rico, which is so obviously desirable that it hardly needs to be argued. It was discussed sympathetically in Governor Tugwell's recent address to the Puerto Rican legislature, the full text of which has just reached this country. Governor Tugwell also pointed out that Puerto Rico has a crying need for able local administrators, and that the way to get them lies through creating and maintaining high civil-service standards. We hope that lesson will not be lost on the Congress of the United States, which is now considering the atrocious MacKellar bill, which would submit many thousands of federal employees to confirmation by the Senate and open the door to an orgy of pork-barrel politics. Governor Tugwell's address was pointed at the realities of the Puerto Rican situation. It is a good answer to the contemptible American campaign, in Congress and in some newspapers, to "get" him, as a preliminary to "getting" the President and the Democratic Party in 1944.

The President Holds the Line

THE OLD ROOSEVELT came back to us last week. His action in ordering a halt to the increase in prices and wages was in his very best vein, and one that has been sadly missing most of the time since he became engrossed in the military aspects of the war. In its political timing his action was perfect. It was exactly the kind of thing for which the presidency was created and which, in most circumstances, only the President can accomplish.

An overwhelming majority in the nation, taken as a whole, does not want inflation and would prefer to see the cost of living remain where it is. But many separate parts of this majority, taken by themselves, are fearful that other parts will succeed in boosting the prices of what they have for sale, whether goods or services, and so are pressing for higher prices of their own products so as not to fall behind the procession. Congress, with its piecemeal representation, reflects the pressure of the parts more strongly than the interests of the whole. The President can speak for all together, balancing the parts against one another. When he does so, he seldom fails to strengthen his support.

The order is not so inflexible as to be unjust, even though its application covers the whole field. Farm prices are to be held at parity, but any which are below parity may rise to it. Wages which have not been increased 15 percent since the start of the defense program, in accord with the Little Steel formula, may still be allowed to rise, as may those which are so low as to result in substandard living conditions. But these instances are now really exceptional and do not threaten increases of cost in important sectors of the economy.

By taking a stand of this kind the President has prepared a well-nigh impregnable position against those who were most imminently threatening to upset the stabilization program. The farm bloc can no longer urge its price-boosting measures on the ground that wages are getting out of hand; if it passes any measure in Congress which Mr. Roosevelt must veto in order to support his order, he will have such a powerful public sentiment behind him that Congress would scarcely dare to override the veto. If John L. Lewis attempts to force the government to sanction more wage increases for the miners than would be justified by the established policy, the President is bound to hold out against him, and in doing so will have solid backing not only from the farmers and the general public but from most of organized labor as well.

Lewis is a hard fighter, but he is probably too clever a politician to court almost certain defeat. If he does not settle with the operators he must accept the arbitrament of the War Labor Board. He knows in advance what principles will guide its decision, and he knows in advance that if he tries to go over its head the same principles will be applied by any other authority representing the President. He must either surrender as gracefully as possible or carry on a strike against all the power of the government and a united people.

Direct price control henceforth will depend on vigorous and skillful administration. Though some improvement may be made in this field, the OPA and the other agencies concerned are making headway against their difficulties. But much still remains to be done in order that the controlling authorities may not be confronted with too strong economic pressures.

First and most important, the pressure of surplus purchasing power on the markets must be reduced by an adequate program of taxation and borrowing from the current income of the citizens. Though this is constitutionally the province of Congress, the executive may, through the Treasury Department, help to force its hand by presenting a rounded and total program, behind which the President might muster the same kind of support he has now won for price control.

Scarcely less in order of importance is the need to increase, by every means which will not interfere with military necessities, the quantity of goods available for the civilians, especially the quantity of necessary foodstuffs. More powerful representation of the needs of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civilian supply in the war economic control will promote this effort, as will measures to make sure that there are enough farm labor, machinery and fertilizer. In the matter of farm labor, Congress is obstructing an efficient policy by striving in the special interest of certain districts to tie labor to the regions where it happens to be, regardless of how much and how well it is used there. Here again the power of the President to speak for the general interest might be used to advantage.

Doctors in Wartime (Cont'd)

RECENTLY THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION, in a long and cautious survey of the effect of the shortage of doctors on the civilian population, revealed that the voluntary relocation of doctors has proved extremely difficult and that in some communities local medical groups have resisted attempts to place outside doctors in their area. In an editorial of February 22, 1943, The New Republic discussed the critical scarcity of doctors in certain localities and pointed out that one of the reasons for this dangerous situation "is that before a doctor can be moved into any state, the medical society of that state must give its consent, and that is very hard to get." Dr. Morris Fishbein, the indefatigable watchdog of the American Medical Association, holds this statement to be untrue and maintains that the right to practise in any state is a power that rests with the state boards of registration and education. Dr. Fishbein's criticism is meticulously correct, but it ignores the underlying reality that licensing boards as a rule consult with the Medical Societies on matters of policy, and it is a rare instance in which a state board pursues a course in opposition to the ways of organized medicine.

We said also in our earlier editorial that the intransigent attitude of the doctors has for years similarly blocked the United States Public Health Service in its effort to carry out projects for immunization, surveys of tuberculosis and venereal disease and work on the health of mothers and children. That this situation has not changed for the better is disclosed by the OWI survey, which finds the Public Health Service hampered at present not only by lack of funds, but also in a number of instances by the "disinclination of medical groups to allow a physician paid by the Public Health Service to practise medicine in a particular community."

Through private sources of information we are able to multiply the instances in which local medical societies have obstructed the efforts of public-health officials. In one state, the state health department has a well equipped traveling unit for the diagnosis of tuberculosis, which, however, can enter a county only at the invitation of the local medical society and only patients referred by a family physician are accepted for examination. In two counties in a Southern state, venereal-disease clinics are very much hampered because of the hostile attitude of the local physicians, several of whom frankly tell individuals that if they attend the public venereal-disease clinic they will not be taken as patients for any other disease that they might have. The clinics in these two counties at one time had fewer than one hundred patients receiving treatment, although the records available showed that approximately five times that number needed treatment and were considered medically indigent.

In the capital city of a Western state, the local medical society endorsed a city-county health unit, but with the proviso that no additional personnel be added to the staff during the present emergency, that no child-health and maternity clinics be added, and that no venereal-disease clinics be conducted. In two counties in a Middle Western state, efforts by the director of the health unit to develop a program of vaccination for the general population and tuberculin skin-testing in certain schools have met with the general opposition of the medical profession. The profession is willing to support such a program only if individuals to be vaccinated or tested are sent to the offices of the physicians who are to be paid for this service by each individual. Both of these last-mentioned counties have had a considerable influx of population during the construction of a large war plant.

The anti-social activities of the medical societies were a burden we could ill afford in more normal times. Now when one-third of our doctors in active full-time practice are in the armed services, when communities vital to our war program are critically in need of doctors, and when the doctors—many of them elderly—who are still available to the civilian population are overworked to the point of exhaustion, it is time that medical societies relinquish those of their time-honored (and dishonored) privileges that stand in the way of an orderly and humane effort to maintain the nation's health.

Freight Rates Down South

THE QUESTION of freight rates in the South came back into the limelight again recently when Gov. Sam Jones of Louisiana singled out this issue as a base for his attacks against the New Deal in a Saturday Evening Post article. Governor Jones predicted that the South will bolt the Democratic Party in 1944 because gross inequities like the present discriminatory freight structure in Southern territory have not been corrected by the present administration. At the recent meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference, Jones made further headway in winning other dissident Governors to his side by using the freight-rate question as his main argument.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is fortunate for the President, therefore, that his efforts to get something done about this discrimination against the South and other sections of the country are finally beginning to bear fruit. Recently the three-man board which had been created by Congress to study the question in 1940 brought in its report, which agreed that the South and Southwest are discriminated against by the present rate structure, and held that uniformity is essential to the economic development of all parts of the country. The majority report recommended congressional action to remove the existing differentials, by amending the Interstate Commerce Commission Act so as to give the commission a clear mandate to carry out the committee's proposals. The committee report was received enthusiastically by a good part of the Congress. Sen. Tom Stewart went a step further and introduced a resolution calling for federal aid in paying freight charges imposed on small businesses handling war contracts, so as to compensate them for discrimination.

A few days ago, also, the Interstate Commerce Commission held what will most likely be the final hearing in its almost two years of investigations into the freight-rate structure of the United States east of the Rockies. Perhaps the commission's findings, which it must now prepare, will follow the line of the recent special board's report even without a congressional mandate to do so. The fact that Roosevelt has appointed three Southerners to the ICC during his administration may prove to be not without influence.

Appeasing the Farm Bloc

A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION of the farmers in the Middle West have served notice on Food Administrator Chester Davis that they want no more administration appeasement of the Farm Bureau Federation and that organization's friends in Congress. Not much has been said about the flood of mail from Midwestern farmers which poured over congressional desks in the last stages of the fight on the inflationary Pace bill. Midwestern farmers were talking up to their representatives, calling for the defeat of the Pace bill and the Bankhead bill too, for though others may have lost their perspective, these tillers of the soil were remembering the old lesson that it is the farmer who suffers most in the aftermath of an inflationary high-price period.

President Earl Smith of the Illinois Farm Bureau Federation, the man who really tells front-man Ed O'Neal what to do, under this farmer pressure and other pressures had to switch his position on the Pace bill and wire Farm Bureau man, Rep. Everett Dirksen, to change his mind and his vote accordingly. Iowa Farm Bureau President Francis Johnson likewise sensed the strength of the mounting pressure and decided to reverse his previous approval of the Pace bill.

Secretary Wickard was flabbergasted by this rebuff to his overcautious policies toward the Farm Bureau and the farm bloc. He would have been even more flabbergasted if he had known that a prime mover in the revolt was one of his own men, Harry Schooler, director of the AAA North Central Division for the past six years. When the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee tore up Wickard's plan for incentive payments, Schooler decided that the time for being a good sport and trying to work with the Farm Bureau gang was passed. So he set out on his own to give that message to the Midwestern farmers whom he had in the past urged to "coöperate" and "maintain unity."

He told them that the only basis upon which unity of farm forces was possible was unity in support of the Commander-in-Chief and his war plans, and he further told them that it was now clear that the Farm Bureau leaders had no intention of supporting the President. There are some who interpret these actions of Schooler's in recent months as violations of the provisions that prohibit federal employees from engaging in political activities or trying to influence legislation. Schooler says on the contrary that writing to your congressmen and urging others to do the same is the right of every citizen.

Chester Davis evidently disagrees with Schooler, for after Farm Bureau Representative Clarence Cannon telephoned to protest Schooler's activity in the Middle West, on these current measures, Davis asked Schooler to get out. But we can be sure that Schooler is only getting out of the Department of Agriculture and not out of the fight against inflation. And we can be sure that Farm Bureau leaders in several key Midwest states will feel the wrath of their rank-and-file members, who agree with Schooler, when the next Farm Bureau state elections come along.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: BYRON DEXTER, VARIAN FRY, ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the Fear of Russia

IN A JOURNEY of some months through North American I have met, both in Canada and in the United States, repeated suggestions of a danger of world revolution in case of Russia's victory in the present war.

To start with, when shall we recognize the obvious fact which stares hard into our faces that this suggestion has throughout been the principal weapon of Hitler's propaganda? He began with it in "Mein Kampf" and he goes on with it up to today; in fact he was never more vocal on the subject than in his latest utterances. He is still "saving the world from Bolshevism," though in Russia itself what we used to describe as Bolshevism is dead as a doornail. Hitler wants to conquer Russia, and that is why he keeps up this smoke screen. Why play his game for him?

"When we are talking of more ground and room in Europe," wrote Hitler in "Mein Kampf," "we can in the first place only think of Russia and the border states dependent on her. . . . The gigantic empire in the East is ripe for collapse, and the end of the Jewish domination in Russia will also be the end of the Russian state itself." (Note: "Mein Kampf," Vol. II, pp. 742-3.) That is what he is trying to do now.

Next to Bolshevism in Hitler's speeches nearly always follows the word "Jew." In April, 1939, within a month or two of concluding the Russo-German pact, Hitler spoke almost ravingly at Wilhelmshaven of "that Jewish sponge fungus." Not only Russia but Britain and America are charged with being controlled by Jews. Meanwhile, for more than ten years there has been a current joke in Moscow, "What is the difference between Moses and Stalin? Moses led the people out of Egypt and Stalin led them out of the Central Executive Committee."

The fact is that both in Britain and in America we are pitifully out of date in our understanding of the vast changes which have taken place in Russia in the last twenty-five years, though Russia's fight in the world's battle is enough to make them hit the naked eye. This has its simple explanation. For over twenty years past the only Russians with whom we could meet and talk have been emigrants who left Russia as long ago as that and could never go back; so their news was always out of date. One simply did not meet ordinary Soviet citizens outside Russia. Press men found it hard to penetrate there and then found they could hardly send out anything that was worth printing. These were professional men, so they came out disgruntled and even their books were biased. Ever since the intervention of 1919, the Soviets have been under the constant obsession of an impending attack, now realized. There is nothing that has done more to obstruct good will with Russia than this official secretiveness, and there can be no real intercourse as between peoples till that heavy curtain is down. And then there is also the profound ignorance and superficiality of our own ideas on this subject, for Russia and Russians lay outside all our courses of study.

As the present ideas which I meet are constantly twenty years out of date, we must go back and see what has really happened in Russia. The evidence has long been conclusive enough and is now overwhelming. A distraught lady, trying to save a tottering autocracy for her sick boy, sent her weak-willed husband to play at commander-in-chief and, as is proved by her letters to him and by the most complete documentary evidence, entrusted all the major decisions of government to a lewd charlatan whom she regarded as the voice of God because her boy was kept alive by his hypnotism. A brave but illiterate army was sent unarmed to the shambles, and the worn-out monarchy went down in a blood bath of casualties which covered the country. This and in no way Marxism was the real cause of the Russian Revolution. Society was breaking up, and it was essential to put some new authority in the yawning gap thus created.

A month later men with no administrative experience but with a burning purpose, pledged to a new doctrine planned for industrial countries and not for agrarian Russia, returned from abroad to set up a new order for which there had been no lasting historical precedent. They were ruthless in their purpose, world-wide in their challenge and ridiculous in their first experiments. They closed all shops without having prepared any substitute, and the towns starved. They entrusted factories to general assemblies of the workers, and the factories went to ruin; they paid wages irrespective of work, and the workers stopped working; they claimed all profits except bare maintenance from the labor of the peasants, and the peasants stopped producing. They confiscated far and wide, and foreign trade disappeared. They won their civil war against the dispossessed and their foreign helpers, but they had ruined the country. However, they were willing learners, and these fantastic experiments were thrown aside and never repeated in the same form. Meanwhile, faced by a merciless and victorious enemy, they had had to abandon nearly everything won by Russia in the last 200 years on her western side, including the lifework of their greatest sovereign, Peter the Great. The world revolution to which they had sacrificed the interests of Russia failed to materialize.

From 1921 Russia was a country ruled by communists who had ceased to practise communism. They had tried to abolish money, but now they had to come back

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

painfully to some kind of currency and had to appeal to the foreign governments which they had challenged, for the means to carry on. They still clung to the hope that the doctrines of Marx might triumph in those industrial countries for which they were intended, but there followed three impressive fiascos—the failure of communist revolution in Germany in 1923, the failure of the general strike in Britain in 1926, and the defeat of communism in China by Chiang Kai-shek in 1927. It was precisely the completeness of these failures, where no civil war materialized, that was so conclusive—far more so than if there had been campaigns, battles and a victory for their adversaries. They had not won a single country to their ideas; the net results of all their efforts to stir up trouble abroad were fascism and Nazism.

The Communist Party had established itself as the real ruler of Russia, but it was split from end to end by the effect of these failures. And after the bitterest possible quarrel between its leaders, it changed radically both in its objectives and in its composition. It was a sheer fight between two men. On the one side Trotsky, internationalist by his origin in a race that has no country, brilliant linguist, journalist and orator, artist of conspiracy whose work had lain outside Russia, stirring up revolutions against all governments. On the other side Stalin, son of a cobbler who knew no languages and had hardly ever been abroad but had fought the Tsar grimly on his own ground, jailed five times and ultimately a winner, a man in whom the horse sense of the working classes rose to genius and by all his past and all his environment made for the people to whom he belonged. To Trotsky's iteration of the worn-out plea of "continuous revolution" he opposed his own sensible mottoes which have remained permanent, and no one can be excused for not realizing the contrast. "Socialism [he does not say "communism"] in one country" (his own). "Revolution is not for export; every country must make its own" (and even Lenin said that). "We are quite ready for working relations with any foreign government, even capitalist, which is friendly to the Soviet Union"; this last proved the indispensable basis of the alliance of today. The country, Russia, has come back, and step by step drives the world revolution into a remoter corner. "He [Stalin] said to me himself," writes Joseph E. Davies, American Ambassador, "that they figured that for him and his associates to achieve that (socialistic-communistic community in Russia that would be a model for the world) was a man-sized job and as much as they could do without trying to run the whole world." Ever since 1922 the Russians have assured us in vain that in Russia we should find "communists but not communism." And today anyone there, official or otherwise, will tell you the same.

The straight fight between Stalin and Trotsky was a very sharp one. By 1929 Stalin had won outright. He had evidently the support of the country and in particular of the young who, by the conditions of the time, had long since been cut off from Europe. He drove his rival from point to point and ultimately back into exile from which Trotsky practised all his old arts to bring down his hated enemy.

Stalin could now turn to his own program, which was one of construction inside Russia itself. And the "one country" was large enough to go its own way, for it covered nearly a sixth of the land surface of the earth and was endowed with the richest of undeveloped resources. There could have been no appeal, at once more commanding or practical, than for the working up of all these potential riches not for individual owners but for the community as a whole. And this recaptured the enthusiasm both of the party and of the people. We have ourselves to blame if we cannot see the contrast between this practical and patriotic program and the vain pursuit of world revolution; and the retreat of dictation was itself the surest way to respect, good will or even to imitation in other countries. Stalin has no record of successes in world revolution. According to Trotsky, it is he who spoiled the favorable chances in 1923, 1926 and 1927; and that is why Trotsky's indictment bears the title "The Revolution Betrayed." Stalin is a home statesman, with a home record of construction, and the new generation which he has created consists not of world conspirators but of technicians, administrators and builders, who base their enthusiasm on achievements at home.

Two objects face any patriotic statesman: to raise the level of well-being in his own country and to make it defensible against the invader. And both objects had behind them evidence painful enough in the recent past to drive them home on a ruler of Russia. Both alike demanded that Russia should acquire her own heavy plant, which could not be obtained without the good will of other countries. Confiscation had long since been discontinued as senseless, but the smell of it still hung heavy over the rest of the world. Russia could only buy at a hard bargain, and meanwhile belts must be tightened in hopes of the future, for it would be long before the heavy plant could yield its results, and meanwhile the growing recovery of the country must be again delayed. Besides, there were inevitably mistakes to be faced and lessons to be learned. Clearly in this critical period there was a chance of turning the country against Stalin, and it was certainly taken. No one will suggest that there were not numerous innocents who perished in Stalin's ruthless suppression of all opposition, but certainly there was organized and systematic wrecking. In 1934 came the time when the Plan at last turned the corner and the long awaited "consumers' goods" began to appear. From that moment Stalin had won through, and with him the home program as against world revolution. Stalin was dealing with a kind of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Fifth Column," but we have yet to realize that the principal victims of his purges were precisely the world revolutionists who hoped—for a time, not without reason—that if they could unseat him they might bring Russia back to their own program. No doubt those of them who are outside Russia have just the same wish now.

In his first ruthless push of industrialization Stalin had throughout been working against a time-limit. Evidently he acquainted himself with Hitler's program, as outlined in "Mein Kampf," much earlier than our statesmen of the west, and this was natural enough in view of the direct threat to Russia which was long ago contained in it. The end of the first Russian Five-Year plan saw Hitler master of Germany, and this was only one of two challenges. Stalin was threatened at his front door by Germany and at his back door by Japan, just the two powers which are making the same fateful challenge to Britain and America.

All the ensuing legislation, which I published at the time without comment in London, showed clearly how his mind was working, for his thoughts passed directly into action. Russia was ruled by 2,000,000 communists —a number far less than the casualties to be expected in another general war, and these were, so to speak, the "first-class citizens" of the country. Stalin in his work of industrialization and collectivization, which the present war has proved to have been so indispensable, had at one time been almost at war with the main body of his own people—the peasantry. If they were to be expected to defend their country, and—still more doubtful—himself as their ruler, he must give some satisfaction to their elementary instincts, and this he at once resolutely proceeded to do. I could not fail to see from this legislation that the waters were now running in a new direction—back to Russia and patriotism in the sharpest contrast with world revolution.

The first instinct to satisfy was that of property, and this is how that matter stands now. The peasant's house is his property, also his kitchen garden, with a small allotment in personal holding. Within reasonable limitations he has his livestock, and also his share in his collective farm, which, by the most rigorous bookkeeping, depends on the work which he has put into it. He may not acquire anything by the hired labor of others, but what he has himself earned is guaranteed to him by the state as his property and can be invested in the savings bank or bequeathed. Without all this, Stalin could hardly have expected the resolute resistance now being made by the guerrillas; for the guerrilla is in substance the collective farm in arms. Meanwhile, the factory worker was encouraged to do his best by a progressive overpayment, according to the amount by which he exceeded his assignment.

The family was brought back to full honor, discipline fully and sternly reëstablished among the young. Divorce was penalized by a progressive tax mounting according to repetition. Abortion, formerly indulged, became a grave criminal offense. No wonder that Trotsky in his bitterness of exile wrote: "The Fifth Commandment has returned to Russia and also the Seventh, though so far without any actual reference to God," but that too was to come later.

Learning, which had become sheer propaganda, was restored to objectivity. Merit became the only road to the university. In a famous decree, which came directly from himself, Stalin denounced "the overburdening of school children and pioneers with civic and political training" (April 24, 1934). Knowledge was "debunked." The chairs of History were restored in universities, and the authority of the teachers reasserted. A revised official history of Russia called back to honor all the glories of Russia's national past; religion was declared to have been at first, before the subsequent official degradation, a self-evident step forward in civilization.

We must not fail to recognize that these radical changes, if they were acts of grace, or rather of intelligence, on the part of Stalin, were also triumphs for the main body of the people and were therefore, in their way, moves in the direction of democracy. They were crowned by a constitution of 1936, directly named after Stalin, which at first looked like the frankest recognition of the same principle, only to be curtailed for the time by measures of repression obviously connected with the coming war.

Stalin's foreign policy was even easier to understand, though foreign ignorance and suspicion prevented the understanding. Clearly he had to seek coöperation with those who were threatened by the same enemies, and he did so without delay. Relations with the United States had never been resumed since the Revolution: he restored them as soon as possible (November 16, 1933). He made first a pact (November, 1932) and then an alliance (May 2, 1935) with France, another democracy. In September, 1934, he brought Russia into the center of the Anglo-French combination, the League of Nations. And his Foreign Minister Litvinov, who played an outstanding part at Geneva, at each new aggression of the hostile camp called for a common front against it. Stalin's primary interest was world peace, in order that he might continue the task into which he had thrown his heart and his energy, that of home construction, which must inevitably suffer from a new war. This had been clear ever since the Soviets had let the Chinese Eastern Railway, an earlier achievement of Russian policy and construction and an essential section of a world trunk-line, go to Japan for an old song. In Ethiopia Russia stood strongly for the Ethiopians. In Spain, after replying first with efficient help to the provocative challenge of Italy and Germany, Stalin chose to stand in with the democracies in the hope that the futile Non-Intervention Committee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in London would at last challenge all intervention. In all this policy he has been denounced by Trotsky as a betrayer of world revolution, and in Spain the two were engaged in a sharp subterranean war among the Spanish communists. Russia made a treaty with Czecho-Slovakia, and both before and *after* Munich offered her support. The long, abortive negotiations with Britain and France in 1939 were, on Stalin's part, another attempt to present a common front to Hitler's aggressions. Ignorance, suspicions and misunderstandings on both sides prevented its realization then, but at a heavy price we have it now.

By the Russo-German Pact of August 23, 1939, which was never an alliance, whether political, military or economic, and has best been described as "the pact which was also a duel," Russia gained great advantages: a respite of a year and a half, time to study the novelties of German warfare as practised on others, and the chance of snatching back part of that territory lost in the last war. It had been threatened by Hitler in "Mein Kampf," and formed a kind of *gracis* incapable of self-defense and consisting for the most part of Russian population. On the Baltic, Stalin also tried to recover the lost gates of Leningrad, the special achievement of Peter the Great; this was also threatened by Hitler, who had already begun work on Memel. On the south side of the Gulf of Finland he succeeded. Finland was his most serious miscalculation, and here he had ultimately to content himself with pushing back the frontier a little further from Leningrad, which was only some twenty miles off. Russia has no need to fear Finland, so long as Finland is not, as at present, a springboard for a German attack on Leningrad. At present Hitler holds all this disputed territory and someone has got to drive him out.

It was only a repetition of the fatal logic of Napoleon that Hitler, baffled in the direct invasion of Britain, should turn eastward to bring all Europe under his control which led, by the same fatal logic, to the invasion of Russia. With hardly any resistance, he pushed his way through the frail structure of French policy which by a system of alliances had tried to paste together little states full of mutual jealousies into some kind of an eastern barrier. Russia saw well what was coming, and was preparing hectically to meet invasion. After the first pettish irritation at the diplomatic failure of 1939, she was brought back to gravity by the fall of France and the imminent danger to Britain, which left her the next on the list. At once, the Allied war news took first place in the Russian press which, in sharp contrast to Mussolini, assured its public that Britain as yet was by no means beaten. As far as possible, everything was ready for June 22, 1941, when she stood firm against the extravagant demands of Hitler; and the statesmanship of Churchill, that same day, turned the danger of Russia into a logical alliance with Britain.

I will not go further into the detail of the magnificent resistance of the Russian people in arms, forecast by Churchill as the foundation of the British alliance; but I must emphasize the decisive influence which it has had on my country. It is true the Russians, as Churchill pictured them at that time, are defending their own homes; but by the valor of that defense they are rendering to us the highest service which one people can render to another, and it is one which we cannot possibly fail to recognize and remember. At countless meetings which I have attended in all parts of Britain, with every party represented on the platform, the mayor, as the non-party chairman, will remind the audience that it is the valor of that resistance that has given us more than a year's respite from perhaps the gravest danger that has ever threatened us, and often the most eloquent tribute will come from the spokesman of the Conservatives. Everyone is now asking why our forecasts were so completely misleading. This unanimity of deep gratitude, naturally enough, is markedly the strongest in those cities which have suffered most from bombing; for this time we have had the war in our rear and that factor is now the fountain of our energies. While in this country, I have sometimes heard loose talk of a third war against Russia. Do not expect us to take any part in such criminal foolishness or throw away the friend whom Hitler has so stupidly given us beyond the deserts of our past understanding.

What will Stalin do after victory? We have to wait for the victory, but perhaps this sketch will offer some answer. The normal thing for Stalin to do is to return to that vast program of home construction, so far only initiated, which has been the great task of his life. It is simple fantasy to imagine that the man who drove out Trotsky on the issue of world revolution will now desert to the program of his bitterest enemy, for which he is himself so little equipped, and leave Stalingrad and the Dnieper Dam in ruins while he follows this will-o'-the-wisp. The leadership of Stalin is very much nearer to the ground than that of Hitler, and if he did so, there is enough of the instinct of democracy in the people whom he led throughout the periods of preparation and of battle to call his attention to its own material interests which he has so well understood and directed.

If we have all been twenty years late in our theories and forecasts, this is equally true of the Communist Parties abroad, who have been just as unintelligent and must have been among Stalin's gravest embarrassments. After he defeated Trotsky, he did not let the Comintern meet for six years; and when it was at last restored, it had become an agency not of world revolution but of Soviet, that is to say Russian, policy. It would be much the best, if as far as Russia is concerned it was scrapped altogether, but possibly that is too much

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to expect. Anyhow, world revolution is an out-of-date catchword in Russia itself. One no longer finds any real interest in it. The present regime in Russia makes no claim to be communist, and communism itself is no longer to be explained by the fantasies of 1917 to 1921. To repeat, the Communist Party itself has changed completely both in its objectives and in its composition. The original Bolshevism now lives its main life in the imagination of Hitler.

As to future peace, that is what Stalin, thinking only in the interests of his own country, has wanted all along. Britain has already given him a guarantee for twenty years against German aggression, and Russia—witness her present condition—is in as dire need of that guarantee as any country in Europe. Stalin is entrenched in suspicions and prejudices which are not those of a world revolutionary but of the ruler of Russia, but we must recognize that he knows his own interests and that peace on his borders is the first requisite for his continuance of his own task. He will stand for the frontiers which he feels that Russia has the right to claim; he is not likely to accept the chance decisions of 1939 when Russia was at her weakest, torn by the revolution and the civil war, as standardizing forever the claims of Russia, least of all where the question is one of Russian population; in my opinion he will foster friendship with the smaller Slav states to the west of him—an independent Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria—which are the best of buffers against German aggression. A Poland Proper under Russian rule could be nothing but an open sore upon his frontier and a focus for German intrigues. But in the main his eye ranges wide over the vast expanse of his own Soviet state and those vast potentialities which it has been his merit almost for the first time to call into life.

But if peace is to be permanent it must before all things be a peace of peoples. Let him, like us, forget the rancors of the past, for it is only by throwing the doors open that intercourse between peoples for mutual benefit of exchange and culture can be made a practical reality.

BERNARD PARES

Will It Be a Fourth Term?

NINE OUT OF EVERY TEN persons in Washington believe that President Roosevelt is a candidate for a fourth term. The one who believes that he is not a candidate argues that war in Europe will be drawing to a close in the summer of 1944, that the President, with his sense of history, will not gamble his reputation by running again and risking defeat, and that the man is weary from the long years in office and would like to retire.

If the war is in a critical stage next year, the pressure upon Mr. Roosevelt to remain in the White House will be enormous. An anti-New Deal Democratic Senator told me the other day that if the war is not over, the President must be drafted. From people who are sick of the halfway measures in the Department of Agriculture and who are fed up with the muddling over manpower and the delays in inflation control, I have heard expressions in support of Roosevelt for President until the war is finished.

It is worth noting that the first premise of those who believe Mr. Roosevelt is not a candidate is that the war will be over in Europe, and possibly in Asia, before the end of his third term in January, 1945. Militarily also, that is a minority view, not shared by many officers outside the Air Forces. With military problems as complex as they are, and with the probability that many unforeseen factors will emerge between now and the 1944 elections, political prophecies are not worth much today. The fourth term still is a long way off. A review, however, of what is now in the wind may be worthwhile.

Politicians of both major parties have beat the fourth-term drums. Their aims are different, but in both cases their motives are selfish. From the point of view of Republicans, a fourth-term campaign would be hard to beat. If the President's candidacy were not a potent threat to their chances next year, Republicans would not be trying to stampede state legislatures, and even Congress itself, into passing anti-fourth-term resolutions. They know that Mr. Roosevelt is stronger than his party, that he can win victories denied ordinary Democrats. They know that despite Republican gains in 1942, the President remains the dominant American political figure. They know that as of this moment he can have the Democratic nomination if he wants it.

That it is unwise and even unpatriotic for the nation to indulge in bitter political controversy at this time has not occurred to run-of-the-mine politicians of either persuasion. But neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Willkie has played their game. Each in his own way has avoided entering the public debate at this time. Democratic National Committee Chairman Frank C. Walker's suggestion that the conventions be held next year in September rather than in the customary month of June has not been accepted by the Republicans. They argue that a short campaign is what President Roosevelt wants, but that it would be a disadvantage to a Republican trying to sell himself to the people for the first time.

It will be admitted by any independent thinker that as far as international affairs are concerned it would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be disastrous for the President to be renominated and then fail to be reëlected. The defeat would be far more than a personal tragedy for him. If the war has not ended by that time, such a turn of events would be an international catastrophe. Foreign nations look upon Franklin Roosevelt as the American war leader. The United States suffered a loss of prestige in every capital in the world last November because the verdict of the American people was interpreted as a disavowal of the President and of the policies for which he stood. People outside the United States were not aware that domestic and local issues were paramount in the election.

Before Mr. Roosevelt allows himself to be "drafted," therefore, he should be as sure as man can be of victory at the polls. It is said that the President is not a leader of lost causes, and that he will not gamble unless the odds are heavy in his favor.

Some Washington observers insist that if it is in the cards for the Republicans to win, they will do so regardless of who their candidate is. Others argue, more wisely perhaps, that no Republican, with the possible exception of Mr. Willkie, can defeat the President. They say, moreover, that no Democrat, with the possible exception of the President, can beat Mr. Willkie.

The second major question, therefore, after that of whether Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate, is: Can Mr. Willkie get the Republican nomination? The prevailing opinion in Washington is that he cannot. It is admitted, however, that he is stronger than he was six or eight months ago. In fact, he is stronger than he has been at any time since his defeat at the hands of the President two and a half years ago. The 1940 Republican standard-bearer has won several notable victories of late. At the St. Louis GOP committee meeting which elected Harrison Spangler chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Willkie's influence proved greater than had been expected. Since then he has made several excursions into the hinterland and each time has returned with a few more delegates in his pocket. Mr. Willkie believes he has a good chance to win the nomination. Like a great many other persons, he discounts the significance of congressional attacks upon him and of the do-nothingism of the cabal which Republican leaders have organized with the help of anti-New Deal Democrats.

The recent renewal of the Lend-Lease Act by Congress was a moral victory for Mr. Willkie. Two years ago he supported the first lend-lease bill when the Republican Party was sharply divided over it. At that time many members of his party criticized him severely for his endorsement of the administration measure. But now it is not easy for them to hold their grudge against him since their party officially supported renewal of the act. Mr. Willkie has urged Republican congressional leaders not to make a fight against renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. Willkie is now demonstrating the sincerity of his internationalist point of view. In his new book, "One World," he even goes so far as to criticize the whole tariff system which the Republican Party erected decade by decade. It will be interesting to see what effect the discussion caused by the book's frank declarations will have on Mr. Willkie's chance of getting the Republican nomination.

The Republican drift away from isolationism is indicated further by the recent experience of two Senate Republicans. Messrs. Burton of Ohio and Ball of Minnesota, both of whom supported the original lend-lease bill in 1941, at that time received thousands of adversely critical letters from their respective states. The ratio of letters received by the two Senators at that time was about five against to one for lend-lease. Today letters from Minnesota and Ohio on the Ball-Hill-Burton-Hatch resolution calling on the Senate to affirm the intention of the United States to collaborate with other nations in the post-war world have been about fifteen to one in support of the resolution.

Traditionally isolationist states, however, will go to the Republican convention next year somewhat stronger than in 1940. Ten states—Colorado, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Maine, Michigan, North Dakota, South Dakota and Vermont—will each receive three additional delegates because they supported the party nominee in 1940. Eleven other states will also have increased delegate strength because of their Republican vote in 1942. "By a rule adopted at the 1940 Republican convention," Gould Lincoln of The Washington Evening Star explained the other day, "each state which in 1942 elected a Republican Senator—other than those which cast their electoral votes for the Republican presidential candidate in 1940—will also be accorded three additional delegates." These states are Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, West Virginia and Wyoming.

The Bricker boom launched by isolationist Sen. Robert A. Taft has had a slow start, perhaps purposely. To say that the country knows next to nothing about Ohio's favorite son is an understatement. Gov. John W. Bricker is one man who has kept his mouth shut these last few years. When, infrequently, he has opened it, he has uttered sweet Sunday-school nothings. You can't quarrel with a man who is against sin—but you can liken him to Calvin Coolidge.

Some of Governor Bricker's advisers are worried lest his sponsorship by isolationists embarrass him. But party regulars think that by 1944 the country will so greatly desire a change that it won't ask too many questions. To the politicians Governor Bricker is the strong, silent man who can save the party, and maybe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the country. He is a practical politician who has balanced a budget. He does not have a single wild idea—perhaps not even an idea. The type has been successful before. Who would say that it will not be again?

New York's Gov. Thomas E. Dewey is another available candidate. Since he became Governor a few months ago most of the breaks—and publicity—have been in his favor. Unlike Mr. Willkie, who is having a grand and glorious time creating issues and attempting to shape public opinion, Governor Dewey is happy to let the Gallup Poll do his thinking for him. Washington does not look upon the New York Governor as a top-flight contender in 1944. His showing at the 1940 Republican convention in Philadelphia was not too impressive.

Neither does Washington expect Minnesota's Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of the Willkie wing of the party, to be a serious contender next year. By 1948, however, if he remains in the public eye, Governor Stassen should be a potent figure.

In the meantime, it is well to remember that the generals may be the only real heroes in 1944. General George B. McClellan was the Democratic nominee in 1864 against Lincoln, the Republican nominee and McClellan's former Commander-in-Chief. Presidents Washington, Jackson, Taylor, Grant, Harrison and Theodore Roosevelt won their political spurs as military leaders.

Democratic politicians are as unhappy to have President Roosevelt their only real hope for victory as Republicans are to have Mr. Willkie theirs. Mr. Willkie is said to believe that his chances for the nomination will be enhanced if it appears likely that the Democrats will renominate Mr. Roosevelt. It has been suggested that the President, on the other hand, might be willing to retire if he thought the race would be between a Democrat of his choosing and Mr. Willkie, whom he trusts on foreign policy. Whether this "suggestion" is more than gossip remains to be seen.

Should Mr. Roosevelt not be a candidate, it is anybody's guess whom the Democrats will nominate. But unless their nominee has the President's open support, it is almost certain that he will not win. James A. Farley, shrewd politician that he is, must know that as well as the next person. Yet the once "Genial Jim," now "Farley, the Irreconcilable," is a candidate for the nomination. He is bitter in his feelings toward the President and the New Dealers. He was against a third term and he is against a fourth term. But if Jim Farley should win the nomination by some combination of conservative Southerners and Northern city machines, he might be in the same position his candidate John J. Bennett was in during the 1942 New York gubernatorial race. The country is not in the habit of sending conservative Democrats to the White House; when it wants a conservative it votes Republican. Then it can be sure it will get what it wants.

Vice President Henry A. Wallace, the Democratic heir apparent, is a competent and able public figure. He is also a man who can think. But he does not seem to know how to win votes or influence politicians. He has never been popular with the party leaders. He is not popular with them today. It is surprising but true that many Democrats still hold a grudge against him because he was once a Republican. He was of small help to the Democrats in carrying the ticket in 1940. His own state of Iowa, as well as seven other farm states, went Republican.

For all practical purposes the farm vote, even in parts of the South, has been lost to the New Deal. That fact alone may cause the President to think twice before he offers himself as a candidate next year. His appointment of James F. Byrnes, a South Carolinian, as director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, has not had the desired effect of mollifying the farm bloc. Farmers, unfortunately, are inflationists. If Chester C. Davis, the new food administrator, doesn't know that, he will find it out soon enough. In another bid for the farm bloc, however, it is conceivable that the President, if he is a candidate in 1944, might trade Mr. Wallace for Mr. Byrnes as his running mate.

Other Democratic possibilities are just possibilities. Paul V. McNutt has lost ground because of his failure to meet the manpower problem satisfactorily. He is no longer considered a powerful contender for the throne. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn, and Ambassador to England John G. Winant have no important backing, though their names are occasionally mentioned.

Echoes of the Southern revolt against the administration have faded somewhat in recent months, but the basic grievances entertained against the New Deal by Southern traditionalists have not been removed. The average Southerner, however, is a fighting man and he wants to win the war. Other issues to him now are secondary. The new demagogic leaders of the Right have not been able to arouse the Southern masses to white heat. This does not mean that the innate conservatism of the South on racial and farm-price matters has changed. Nor does the fact that Congress is not quite so noisy now as it was in January and February mean that administration attempts toward appeasement have been successful.

Congress, which may or may not reflect the views of a majority of the American people, wants no more of the New Deal. That is certain. The people must demonstrate strong disapproval of the present views of Congress before that body will alter its course. And even if President Roosevelt should be reëlected and should continue to have the support of the people for his war policies, it will be hard for him again to attain a position to initiate reforms at home. Congress' re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak

ception of the report of the National Resources Planning Board is proof of that. The board itself has now been given its walking papers. The Farm Security Administration is in grave danger of being destroyed. The $25,000 salary limitation has been repealed by overwhelming votes of both Houses. There is no point in the New Dealers' kidding themselves. At the best, there are bleak days ahead for them; and at the worst, a long Arctic winter.

Washington CARROLL KILPATRICK

Salvaging the Ships

A Trip Through the Alabama Drydocks

SHIP GARAGE, that's what one man called it, and that is just what it is—the small island where the drydocks stand holding on their floating platforms ships of all sizes, kinds and nationalities. Tankers, cargo ships, transports, as yet unconverted luxury liners and hospital ships are standing side by side. They are here to be patched up. These are the crippled ones gathered from the many different kinds of fleets that are needed in this great war. These are the limpers-in, the towed-in, not the done to death.

On this island, which has been snatched from the flowing mouth of the river and held out of the bay by a throbbing pipe line, is one of the most important industries of this war, the hard, filthy, grim business of reclaiming torn ships.

That these ripped steel merchant ships get in at all is surprising. Walking down the sandy island and looking at the damage done them, one sees a tanker with a 125-foot hole gouged out where three torpedoes had hit her in a row. She got in. She actually stayed on top of the water until she was pulled in. She will lie there in the dock until she has been reconstructed, until new engines can be found and the plates cut and fitted and welded into place, and then she'll go again. She came in with a huge torpedo hole. She had been shelled and raked by machine-gun fire. During the shelling her crew had abandoned her, but for some undisclosed reason a flare was sent up by an unknown ship about three miles away. The flare frightened the submarine, which immediately submerged. The men in the lifeboats saw what had happened and returned to their ship.

This tanker came in. And she came in with holes all over her like a sieve. She had evidently been machine-gunned with 50-caliber shells. They could tell by the hole left where the shell entered its first steel wall. It tore through three steel walls with power exceptional for that size shell. Her radio room was ripped apart. After the engine room, that is the point for which the subs aim. They don't want any SOS sent out. Get the engine. Get her radio. Let her flounder and sink.

How does she stay up? Now there's a question. She is built in water-tight compartments, seven, eight or nine, according to the size of the ship. Blow one, two, or even half of them out, and the others will keep her afloat. In repairing her the torn places are matched and fitted. There's artistry in reconstruction.

Side by side in the drydocks stand two great ships. One is a tanker with two torpedo holes in her, one amidships and the other in her stern. Engines now lie heavy on some ocean bottom and most of her engineers with them. The other is a hospital ship, ready to go, white as a swan and afloat as proudly. She doesn't look as if she had ever been touched. That's where these ships fool you. You can't see their scars too readily.

The tanker was built in this place where she came to be repaired. She weighed approximately 8,200 tons when she was launched. Just a merchantman. No guns. No anti-aircraft, no anti-submarine. When the war broke, she was in this unprotected position. Her men couldn't do a thing but take it. But they could do that. Most of her remaining crew are waiting restlessly for her to be ready to go again. The mounting of the guns aboard her—amidships and aft—makes them eager. They feel that they didn't have a fair chance before and they want to take it as soon as possible. This tanker had two engines. When she was first torpedoed, the starboard engine was blown on top of the portside engine. Practically everybody in her engine room was killed.

The men in the engine room don't have the front-line seats that the men on deck have. They play at a sort of blind man's buff with death. They keep right on watching the instruments, or stoking, or whatever their particular job is, until they come in or are blown to kingdom come. These are the brave boys, the ones with steady nerves, the ones who know the sea as a thing of pounding motors and heat and knots.

Their job demands a certain kind of fatalism which they get sooner or later. One man who had been in a blown-out engine room said that when the torpedo hit, some of the men made a dash for the lifeboats or rafts, but that he had just crouched down by the boiler. They were long gone, "and here I am," he noted with a wry grin. If it's your time, why so it is.

When this tanker came in, the repair crew went to work on her. The repair crew is one place where women are not employed. Theirs is an extremely dangerous and dirty business. Building ships is clean. There are new, unused parts. The steel is shiny and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unsoiled. The blue light of the welder shines in it. Not so these babies which come in for repairs.

The men who work on them frequently stand in grimy water to their knees to rivet or weld the plates back into the bulwarks. And that's not all. The places where they work have been torn by great force. Everything about them has become shaky and unsteady. Pieces of torn steel sometimes fall on the men. When they move a ripped plate or a jagged piece of machinery, that movement is apt to loosen another piece, which may fall. This is when to move at all may be your last move. That is why these men get better pay than the builders of new ships. There is no crabbing on that score from anybody. If ever men deserved it, these do.

There is another phase of this work that is hard to talk about. The torpedoes hit the boats below the waterline. It is impossible for the rest of the crew to get down there to clean the holes out. It is the job of the repair crew to clean her after she has been lifted into the dock. These holes are sometimes the receptacles for parts of human bodies. Even after four or five days of cleaning, some repair man in moving a loose fragment of machinery or tearing away a hanging wall may find an arm or leg.

These repair crews do their jobs and there's nothing said about it. One ship came in with 1,500 suitcases aboard her. That could mean only one thing; that many men were missing and this was what remained to be sent home. The workers at the yard were asked to help take them ashore. This they did. No one spoke. Theirs was a wordless, clenched-jaw procession.

By the side of the raked tanker lies the hospital ship. She weighs about 12,000 tons. She is quiet and serene. She can care for 470 sick men. She is white, with the regulated decorations of hospital ships. Around her sides goes the band of green. On each side of her, at stipulated intervals, are red crosses. These crosses are illuminated by lights hanging from the deck. There is a cross at each end of her deck. There are two lighted crosses on her smokestack. Around her deck are green lights at spaces of five feet. There is no mistaking her. She travels completely lighted at night. There are no guns aboard her. She has only her doctors, nurses, medical aides, crews and medicines. She relies upon human decency for her life.

She will leave the drydocks and go back to her home port empty of any cargo. A complete description of her will be sent to the enemy. Nothing about these hospital ships is secret. Her behavior and code are as immaculate as her appearance. She is subject at any time to enemy inspection and there must be no holes aboard her into which he cannot get.

Her interior is for the most part white. Her bunks are usually two deep. There are, of course, rooms for the more dangerously ill, who cannot be around other men. She is equipped with operating rooms as efficient as those to be found in hospitals. The tables have straps to secure the patient against the rolling of the ship. There are stretchers and rolling tables to move the men from the operating rooms to the bunks.

Aboard this floating lady of mercy are two padded cells for the "nervous." They have eight-inch padding on the walls which is held in place at the bottom by strips of leather. The number of patients for which these rooms are necessary is gratifyingly small.

Most of the hospital ships are converted from passenger ships. So was this one. She was a luxury liner, with three sister ships. The others are gone. She was used at the outbreak of the war as a transport boat. She was not changed much. It was while she was serving in this capacity that she was torpedoed. Her stern was hit. There was a great gap, yet the rudder was untouched. The rudder was cut away when she was brought in and put on land; after the plates had been welded into her bulwarks again and she was whole, the rudder was replaced. Nothing is lost that can be salvaged.

She has broad, sweeping steps, mahogany doors and luxurious fixtures still. Her cabins have been turned into enormous wards. Her salon is a ward. Her recreation room is a ward. There is another recreation room aboard her now, however, for the use of recuperating soldiers.

Her sailing crew waits for her. The sailors want to get back aboard their own ships. This one especially. She is home to them and is indeed a stalwart craft. When she was transporting men and they died aboard her, there was nothing she could do. There was no effort she could make. A feeling of satisfaction now seeps through her sides and runs down her halls and decks. She is accustomed to catering to the comforts of her human cargo.

There's a job these men are doing. They are fixing the old ships, patching and partially currying these old warhorses that are fuming to go. Anxious for the fight, equipped now with guns. Guns to fire into any sky or water. They begrudge every lost moment.

There is a gallantry with a heart of steel about these old ones that have seen service. A testedness that raises pardonable lumps of pride in your throat. The landlubber can feel it. Come from the middle of the American continent, go to that island between the Mobile River and Polecat Bay and look at those tough old ships—those wounded fighters with holes in their sides big enough to stick one of your defense houses in, and try not to feel it!

They have something the new ones can't touch. They have achieved a human value because of the smell and pride and crooked grins of their men. It's a funny thing how human bravery and courage and fortitude can animate cold steel and give soul to their own creation.

SALLY LEE WOODALL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The New Liberals in Congress

THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS is, in many ways, reactionary. And it isn't accomplishing much. Except for passing the lend-lease bill it has frittered away its first three months—on the strength of which it is now planning a jolly spring vacation. Curiously enough, however, this new Congress has brought to Washington some of the best first-team liberal material that has been seen around here in a long time.

Congress is always a paradoxical affair. This past week I heard a veteran conservative, Charles Halleck, (R), of Indiana, tell the House that the OPA's standardization program, including grade labeling, is the "beginning of a Socialistic program"! And over in the Senate I saw a member of the Cabinet spitefully kept waiting on a davenport of the Senate Agriculture Committee for two long hours, while the committee—smarting under the defeat of the Bankhead and Pace bills—heard another witness. Chairman "Cotton Ed" Smith's son and secretary, young E. D. Smith (called "Short Staple" by some) round whose draft status there has been controversy, had summoned Secretary of Agriculture Wickard for 10 A. M. He had simultaneously summoned Prentiss Brown, price administrator, for the same time and hearing. The committee put Wickard on the davenport with his aides, ignored him for two hours, didn't ask him a question, and then ordered him to be back again Monday at 10. The committee was paying him back for having delayed coming to a session a couple of days earlier. Indeed, the inroads on the time of generals, admirals and executives, summoned casually by competing and overlapping congressional committees, is one of the grimmest features of the Washington wartime scene.

Yet this new Congress has gleams of possibility. The most encouraging are certain new House members. The public first became aware of this group when Martin Dies concluded his long harangue for more funds, last February 1. Up stood Will Rogers, thirty-one, just out of Camp Hood, Texas, a crusading liberal, fresh from beating reactionary Leland Ford. He calmly said:

"I should like it to be known that I disagree with the sentiments expressed, the flamboyant manner of expression and the use of this great public forum as a means of what we in Hollywood would call personal publicity."

Smacko. Young Rogers sat down. But he had delivered as direct and brutal a sock in thirty-nine words as Mr. Dies has received on the House floor since he formed his famous "Demagogues' Club."

James Fulbright, (D), of Arkansas, young (thirty-eight), good-looking, intelligent, took it on himself to answer Clare Luce's "Freedom of the Air" speech. He said she had voiced an "imperialistic policy of grab," and that her program was "probably the most effective method imaginable of bringing on a Third World War." Fulbright is a former Rhodes scholar, who comes to Congress from the presidency of the University of Arkansas.

Alvin E. O'Konski, thirty-five-year-old Republican, and LaVerne E. Dilweg, thirty-nine-year-old Democrat, come from progressive Wisconsin, and look like big-league material. O'Konski roused the wrath of fellow Republicans when the House majority voted, 268 to 129, over the young newcomer's vigorous protest, to rescind the President's $25,000 ceiling on war salaries. He is short, dark, dynamic and reads books. He is able to handle himself effectively in debate, after years of coaching championship debating teams. Dilweg is a formidable opponent, too. In fact a number of these new, young liberals are surprisingly articulate. Dilweg, besides a lot of other things, played All-American college and professional football (he was on the Green Bay "Packers"). He is interested in taxation, and has shown sympathy for labor. He married Eleanor Coleman, Olympic swimmer: yes, the four young Dilwegs are all husky.

Another Wisconsinite is Howard McMurray, (D). He is a political scientist, a Ph.D., who taught Government at the University of Wisconsin. He ran, as a public duty, against Rep. Lewis O. Thill, one of the foremost Republican obstructionists, in a city populated largely by German immigrant descendants, and licked the spots off him. "It is Congress that is responsible," he declares, "for every bureaucrat on the payroll."

Two young Democrats, George Outland (thirty-six) and Chet Holifield (thirty-nine) came to Congress from California in this election, along with Will Rogers. They add to the nucleus of articulate, vigorous members, who know what it is all about. Holifield had the nerve to stand up and break the House's stony silence, defending the National Resources Planning Board; Outland, graduate of Harvard, left a professorship at the Santa Barbara Teachers' College to run for Congress, just squeaking through with less than a 1,000-vote majority.

A couple of Irish "Mikes" might be included in the list. Mike Mansfield, (D), from Montana, professor of History, voted against continuing the Dies Committee, probably the best test of general attitude afforded so far in this session, as did the other member, Michael A. Feighan, (D), of Ohio, who has the improbable distinction of being not only a Harvard man and a banker's son, but the representative of a downtown Cleveland slum area, where he knocked off rabble-rousing Coughlinite Martin L. Sweeney. Feighan has had experience as Democratic floor leader in the Ohio state legislature.

This is not a "ten best" list. If it were, for tenth man I might include Brooks Hays, (D), of Arkansas, a Southerner who fought the state poll tax and was a former Federal Security Administration official. Sometimes it is pretty hard to know what constitutes a "liberal," and some of these men may be only flashes in the pan. Hays, like Fulbright, voted in favor of continuing the Dies Committee, and so did a couple of new Minnesota Representatives who promise nevertheless to be helpful acquisitions to the chamber. Dr. Walter H. Judd, (R), erstwhile medical missionary to China, an expert on the Orient, and Farmer-Laborite Harold Hagen seem to fit into the Will Rogers group, in several respects. A man who is certainly no flaming radical, fifty-seven-year-old Republican Daniel Ellison, who for four terms was the only member of his party on the Baltimore city council also deserves to be classed among the promising newcomers.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Trouble with Movies

THE TROUBLE WITH THE MOVIES is that they so seldom get below the surface of a story and its characters, that their whole is rarely as good as the parts, and the characters of their players—Gary Cooper or Margaret Sullavan, for instance—are usually more powerful than the characters they play. The movies don't have any Tom Joneses, Raskolnikovs or Natashas. What you remember about Sergeant York is Gary Cooper. Script writing has been rare that could make the whole equal to its good parts, as were "Alice Adams," "Wuthering Heights" and "The Lady Vanishes." The reason I mention this now—it being always true—is that I have seen four movies in the last week dealing with the resistance to Nazism in the conquered countries, none of which came anywhere near to revealing the nature of such resistance.

They missed the point because they were governed by the traditional attitude of characters subordinated to plot. There are three fundamentals of a traditional movie plot: it is composed of spectacular events, the spectacular part is all that's shown of the event, the events run on one level only, and in one direction as far as time is concerned (the flashback is a beginning toward breaking down this attitude, but it too has become stylized).

It is the use of the literary writer's technique of story-telling (rather than a technique developed especially for movies) which results in scripts that miss the essential fact that the camera medium is enormously fluid: having a voice, eyes and legs, it is more fluid than any other medium. Like the mind, it is physically unbounded and can move into all levels of experience. But traditional movies stick grimly to the conception of telling a story that moves in one direction over the surface, rather than in all directions and in depth. An example of the nimbleness of the medium is seen in a skillful touch in "Now, Voyager," in which a woman who has partially broken away from the domination of her mother is faced with a decision that calls for complete independence. The close-up of her face at this point dissolves into the face of her mother, projecting in a split second the whole psychological relationship. The movies compulsively labor the idea that in order to get their stories told they must proceed in an orderly fashion, from spectacular event number one straight ahead to spectacular event number twenty. (The occasional experiments which go beyond this are few and far between.)

The camera which moves in a close-up to a person's face need not stop there but can go on into his thoughts, the flow of his memory—under the surface. That was the real contribution of "Citizen Kane"—not the three-dimensional photography or the three-dimensional sound, but the three-dimensional character projected by showing Kane's life from many points of view and sources in time. There was a quality in "Citizen Kane" which could stick in the mind, the character had a depth and structure, and a personality other than that of a hero or a villain. Because the movie concerned itself with the living of a life rather than with a life only. But this was the exception. Hollywood projects events and throws the character into the event and the quality of living is never captured. The least thing the painter Strickland did in "The Moon and Sixpence" was paint; the least thing mentally ill Charlotte did in "Now, Voyager" was to suffer the symptoms of mental illness; the least thing first baseman Lou Gehrig did in "Pride of the Yankees" was to play first base. Necessarily, when so little real character is written into their roles, the actual personalities of Saunders, Davis and Cooper must make up the difference.

"Shadow of a Doubt" is an example of what the movies might do in breaking with the idea that the story is more important than the movie. It was not the *plot* that Hitchcock projected, it was the sense of doubt seeping through a certain number of people. He was solely concerned with their behavior and effect on one another as shown by their actions within this doubt. Hitchcock has stopped being dictated to by the necessities of a plot, as he was in "Foreign Correspondent," and is filling his movies with what he is really interested in, and what is interesting to an audience—the use of the camera to tell more about people and a situation than that a muddle arose and was straightened out at the end.

MANNY FARBER

Oklahoma with Details

Oklahoma, a musical play, based on "Green Grow the Lilacs," by Lynn Riggs. Music by Richard Rodgers; book and lyrics by Oscar Hammerstein II; dances by Agnes de Mille. St. James Theatre, March 31, 1943.

THE THEATRE GUILD'S newest venture is one of those happy things in the theatre that call for little more than a mere critical note, in the sense that a country is blest whose annals are short. Lynn Riggs's "Green Grow the Lilacs" would seem by general consent to have deserved a greater success than it had when the Guild produced it some seasons ago; but now it blossoms out with music, dancing, abundant movement and color and ought to prove a show that can keep to Broadway and on the road for a long time. So far as the road goes, in fact, we may say of "Oklahoma" what cannot be said of many musicals: that it could be very considerably cut down in numbers and production and still retain enough engaging, lovable and varied qualities to win favor and restful thanks from audiences throughout the country.

The general handling that has been given this whole production is very shrewd and wise. It is not exactly easy to define, though defining it might help somewhat to make it a useful example and lesson for many a production to come. There is nothing distinguished about it, and nothing chic and nothing smart, but none of these is tried for; what is sought is the open, the friendly and bright and plain American—not the realistic plain American but the Broadway version of what we like to think is our plain, folksy, happy-hearted, waltz-me-around-again-Willie native life and character ways. It has none of that hard-driving, punching, wisecracking professional quality that around Times Square is usually aimed at, and that now and again, as in a show like "Something for the Boys," radiating from Ethel Merman and Cole Porter, comes off with such a distinct, brassy, dazzling triumph. "Oklahoma" leaves out the professional edge. It reminds us at times of a good college show; and more to the point, it has some of the impromptu, house-party, improvised effect that played such

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a part in the success of the first Charlot review that came to us from London.

That the above intentions in the treatment of "Oklahoma" are carried into good, sound theatre terms is proved by the hearty response of the Guild audience.

Mr. Rodgers' songs launch the piece and help to wing it along. "Oh, What a Beautiful Morning" and "People Will Say," for example, are songs full of well-being and happy health and a whistling, swinging step, with an air of springing out of the sheer impulse to sing and so I sing. The comic songs are witty and friendly, like turns at a birthday party. Mr. Miles White's costumes are bright and plentiful; and Lemuel Ayres's settings for these Oklahoma Territory scenes have much of the quality of Grant Wood's paintings but with none of the acid, pseudo-satire and devoted primitivism. Miss Agnes de Mille has treated the dances, which play a large part in the whole, with excellent variety and skill, and with Katharine Sergova and Marc Platt starring to great applause; though the dream pantomime, otherwise good, in the first act is much too long. And Mr. Rouben Mamoulian's directing keeps the entire production friendly, simple, lively and flexible. The one thing to be added is the fact that the evening would gain by being a good many minutes shorter.

The two singing leads who most put the heart, as it were, into the story, are Mr. Alfred Drake and Miss Joan Roberts, both well chosen, both with plenty of voice and both without the banging and whacking methods of most musical-comedy singing. Mr. Drake has good solid experience behind him and Miss Roberts at least a varied year of the stage; but neither of them has any of the stale, ham lyricism that would spoil that amiable impression of sly, gay simplicity that makes the pioneers of Broadway, at least, feel so pleasantly at home. The enunciation, in a show that calls especially for the words to be heard, of all the singers in "Oklahoma" is remarkably clear.

Miss Betty Garde as Aunt Eller, Mr. Joseph Buloff as the Persian peddler, Mr. Lee Dixon as a single-minded cowboy lover, and Mr. Howard da Silva as the dark-minded, jealous hired hand, all gave good performances. The most interesting performance technically perhaps was that of Miss Celeste Holm as the lovelorn, muddle-headed and impressionable Ado Annie Carnes. This is Miss Holm's first musical role, and if you have seen her in other parts, many of them very different from this, you are impressed by this young actress' attempt to do something so sadly needed on our stage, which is to widen her range of characters, in the pursuit of which highly creditable and intelligent variety she includes a genuine study and use of make-up. Miss Holm is pretty enough in face and figure to compete with the rest of them, playing nothing but herself, and so it is all the more to her credit that she chooses otherwise. Her weakest spot at present is in her diction; in some words especially like those with the letters *or* in the middle, as in *sorry*, her accent is fairly discouraging. It is encouraging, however, that we should even notice she has her face, make-up, intentions or accent, as compared with many young players on Broadway, where among the numerous "finds" it is impossible to remember which is which.

And while this friendly-technical mood is on, let me suggest to Mr. Drake and Miss Roberts and Mr. Mamoulian, or whoever directed the songs in "Oklahoma," that this winning enterprise deserves better of them than that Hollywood pronunciation of the word "beautiful." It is not "buit-ee-ful," the word is "beau-ti-ful." Which reminds me of a street-car conductor in Battle Creek who used to call out "sanit-arium," and of a man from Kansas City who called the Greek philosopher "Plate-oh."

STARK YOUNG

The Bandwagon

The latest scheme at Washington to spend our money and our children's children's money is as announced to "take over the backward nations of the world and train them for self-government." That's just a form of dictatorship, what England has been doing with India for 200 years, only this plan would be more benevolent, and instead of making money out of the niggers by exploiting them, you and I would put up the dough for their education. It's just another WPA project, on a more gigantic scale and designed to boost the emergency requiring a fourth term.—*An editorial in The Gunnison (Colo.) News-Champion.*

Not counting Dieppe, Canada's major military operation of the war thus far may be said to be "The Army Show," an all-soldier stage entertainment that is currently rehearsing in Toronto. . . .—*From the Sunday drama section of The New York Times.*

The situation with regard to cold-water flats is appalling. The owners are faced with empty flats. I don't know how they can pay their taxes, for their tenants are moving out. The reason is that these people are earning more money—a lot more.—*From The Yonkers Herald-Statesman.*

Tuesday, a meatless day, is observed with *Scallops Poulette*. . . . The second course is cold loin of pork (roasted on Monday), sliced very thin, with the bone removed.—*Sigourney Thayer in Vogue.*

Democracy in Action

Some months ago Stassen gave up his chauffeur because he thought the chauffeur ought to be in a war industry. Now he drives himself, and Minnesota residents see their governor edging his way into a parking lot like everyone else.—*From June Provines' column in The Chicago Sun.*

That All-Out Effort

Sometimes embassy weddings are very plush affairs. But there'll be one here Saturday that conforms in every way with wartime economies.

Just as Mrs. Edward Beale McLean has stopped sending formal, white cardboard invitations to her famous dinners and has employed telegrams instead, so Mme. Martins, wife of the Brazilian Ambassador, has sent telegrams. . . .—*From the society page of The Washington Daily News.*

Total-War Department

Thirteen of those [draft-dodgers] arrested were released on their assurances they would comply with the law. The others have been arraigned and are awaiting action on criminal charges. One, who had refused to be examined, said the 7 a.m. hour appointed was too early, while another said he had been examined before, and was entirely satisfied with his 4-F rating. —*From The New York Times.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping.—THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Meat-Axing Manpower

SIR: May I take exception to some points in John Beecher's excellent article, "Meat-Axing Manpower," in your issue of March 29?

I think it unfair to describe War Manpower Commission Executive Director Lawrence A. Appley as a "promoter of a patent nostrum—Vick's Vaporub." Mr. Appley is a trained administrator and an intelligent executive. It has been my privilege as a labor member of the Joint Management-Labor Policy Committee of the WMC to be closely associated with Mr. Appley, since he accepted without solicitation his present position. He thoroughly believes in the idea of enlisting the aid of both labor and management in meeting the manpower problem, through the medium of management-labor committees. His services are made available to the WMC by his company on a "without compensation" basis. I am sure I reflect the sentiments of all the labor members of the committee when I say that Mr. Appley won our unanimous respect by his intelligent approach to the gigantic administrative problem in the WMC, and by his untiring efforts in the face of great obstacles to do a decent and constructive administrative job by working with both management and labor and his staff.

There is not now, nor has it ever been claimed that there are, 2,000 management-labor-manpower committees at the plant levels as Mr. Beecher's article implies in the concluding paragraph. There are such committees in each of the twelve regions and perhaps less than one hundred additional in local communities and industrial areas where WMC area directors have been established. The regional and area committees serve not only in an advisory capacity to their respective directors, but as appeals boards to whom both workers and management can appeal from WMC regulations which work hardship upon either.

The 2,000 "labor-management committees" to which Mr. Beecher refers are no doubt the ones set up by request of Donald Nelson of the WPB and are usually referred to as the Production or Labor-Management Victory Committees. Where these committees have good leadership and there exists the necessary environment and atmosphere conducive to real cooperation, they are doing a magnificent job. Those that are not functioning effectively require a measure of direction and guidance which thus far the WPB has not provided.

If there were any real coördination of the various governmental war agencies in Washington, having to do with production and manpower, the extension of the labor-management-committee idea with proper guidance would go far toward solving many of our production and manpower problems in a democratic manner. The democratic process would thereby be extended and fortified, rather than impeded, if not wholly nullified, as the proponents of so-called "National Service Legislation" seem so anxious to achieve.

CLINTON S. GOLDEN,
Assistant to the President, United Steelworkers of America and Member, Management-Labor Policy Committee of the War Manpower Commission

Solesbury, Pa.

SIR: For me, Mr. Golden's word is as good as his name, and I will take it that Mr. Appley is promoting labor-management coöperation as successfully as he promoted a patent nostrum—Vick's Vaporub—before coming to the aid of his country. Such men are possible. For the long haul, though, I should prefer a man with Mr. Golden's background as WMC executive director. Personalities aside, that was my point—labor ought to be running the WMC—and much of what's wrong is because labor isn't.

I did not mean to imply that the plant labor-management committees were set up by the WMC. I referred to the WPB committtees, which ought to be extended, strengthened and given as much responsibility as they can take for labor-use as well as production planning.

New York City JOHN BEECHER

Whose Plan Is It?

SIR: Let's get this thing straight. In his article on "Charter for a New America" [March 22], Max Lerner says, "The plan is in the form of a report from the National Resources Planning Board," and then later in the article calls it "a plan of the President." Now whose plan is it?

Laguna Beach, Calif. F. GRAHAM TOLLIT

[The National Resources Planning Board wrote it because the President, in commissioning them to do so, planned it that way. Therefore, it is his as much as anyone's. In all countries, such commissioned studies have usually borne the imprimatur of the responsible executive. – THE EDITORS]

The Jews in Europe

SIR: At your suggestion, I am summarizing herewith the argument contained in a very much longer statement on the extermination of the Jewish people in Europe, for which you were unable to make room in its entirety.

First. I subjected to examination the new phenomenon which presents itself as National Extermination. *And not only in point of fact,* as already operating in the peculiar one-sided war between the Nazis and Jews, but as a definite threat to life in general, and to all temporarily or permanently helpless peoples in particular. I claim that if this demoniac military novelty is left unchecked, it may be applied to all those European peoples who are now politically and militarily as helpless as the Jews.

Second. I insist that only thanks to anti-Semitism as a protective cover has the very idea of National Extermination, and the perfection of its mechanics in application, been able to make headway without any check and disturbance, to the extent that months of operation and millions of extinguished lives were needed to draw the attention of the outside world. And even now nothing effective is being done which might at least interfere with this devilish, cold-blooded extermination. This new combination of sub-military techniques has already taken 2,000,000 lives and no counter-action has followed, either to hamper its operation or to hinder its perfection. Yet we know that it took only one action to discover and counter-act the U-boat. So also with the parachutist: counter-action followed. The 2,000,000 lives are Jewish lives.

Third. I show that this could happen only because the Jewish people is not only defenseless, but also because it is completely helpless. Even under the threat of national annihilation the world continues to keep the Jewish people in its state of helplessness. One would expect that just because of this helplessness the world would recognize its international obligation, as well as its moral duty, to rush to the Jews' rescue, but this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not the case either. Is there really nothing left for the Jewish people but to go down in protest, prayer and fasting? Yes, there is a solution. If a people *wants to live*, if a people *must live*, *it must be a power itself*. Even if not powerful enough to defend itself against its superior enemy, it should be in a position *to determine* THE QUESTION OF ITS DEFENSE AND DESTINY. The right of self-defense is the most sacred human right. It is the supreme right of the individual and the nation.

Fourth. To leave out a number of factual and theoretical observations, and just to mention the supreme obligation of the democratic nations to cause an immediate change of status of the five million European Jews from that of national disgrace as helpless sheep in the slaughter-house, to the status of national honor as "prisoners of war" (to have at least that right of life in international law!) for whom their brethren fight on the battlefield—I call on my fellow men, Jew and Gentile alike, to stop and think. To think matters over, and over. For in this time of subhuman and inhuman treatment the silenced voice of European Jewry is the sonorous voice of Jewish destiny itself, roaring and demanding the liberation of the Jewish nation. For it is a choice now between liberation or allowing the nation to be exterminated and wiped off the surface of the earth! For if not now, when then? If the climax of this crisis is not sufficient stimulus to both Jew and Gentile to revise the national status of the Jew to that of a legal nation among all other nations of the world, what else can spur us, and when else would it be done? Shall the Jewish problem remain a misfortune for the Jewish people and for the world forever and ever?

Fifth. I insist that *Israel must fight as a nation now.* To that end a Jewish War Council and a Jewish Government in Exile must be formed at once to declare war against Nazi Germany and to begin a worldwide Jewish mobilization for the immediate opening of the Anti-Extermination front as outlined in detail in my thesis. Should exiles of 2,000 years' duration not be honored by international justice at least as exiles of two years' duration, once the People's will was never to surrender its land, nor its National Integrity?

I have little space left, but an alarming story in a recent issue of The New York Post, headlined "Nazi Frenzy Threatens to Murder 5,000,000 Jews by End of Year," forces me to scream to American Jewish leadership: "ACTION!" Action on the part of American Jewry itself! Against the *superhuman* blitz tactics, the Russian "scorched earth" and the self-abandon of the London and Stalingrad epic-type were the necessary action; so also something similar is necessary against the Nazi *subhuman* military tactics, if they are to be met. American Jewry *must* meet the challenge, and Jewish leadership must turn its face resolutely toward American Jewry first.

A call must be given to American Jewry to be prepared on short notice to leave homes, shops, stores, offices, factories, schools and colleges, to stop all studies, all activities, all business and all life. The entire people shall rise and take to the road, without regard to conditions, and where there is no choice, walk afoot to Washington as safely as one can. From Florida in the South; from New England in the North; from the Middle West regions and from the whole East Coast, Jewish humanity shall cover the surface of the earth, all roads and highways and byways, to converge on Washington, the Capital of the World, and from there the cry of the Jew shall reach the four corners of the world:

We are a Living Nation and we want to live!
Give us arms and munitions and we shall open our Anti-Extermination Front.
We must fight to the death for the lives of our trapped European brethren!

New York City ZALMON BERUL

The Farm-Labor Crisis

SIR: The nation's farm-labor problem becomes more muddled with rapid progress toward enactment of a bill by Rep. Clarence Cannon of Missouri which turns over to the various state Agricultural Extension Services the job of supplying manpower on the land.

The Cannon bill, which soon goes to the President, was instigated, it is said, by the American Farm Bureau Federation. According to reports the measure was so vicious that the other reactionary farm organizations—the National Grange and Council of Farmer Coöperatives—refused to join the Bureau in sponsoring its introduction. This Resolution, H. J. 96, appropriates the sum of $26,100,000 for the purpose of recruiting, training and transporting farm workers with the provision that no part of the funds appropriated shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate or impose minimum wages or standards of housing, to regulate hours of work or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership.

The Farm Security Administration, which has transported more than 6,000 domestic and Mexican farm workers to critical labor-shortage areas, is to be permitted only thirty days to liquidate its projects. Likewise under terms of the bill the ninety-five FSA migratory farm-labor camps are ordered turned over to the State Extension Service for operation. The agreement negotiated last June to permit the importation of Mexican workers to work on farms of the United States is to be renegotiated, presumably without any guarantee of wages, housing or other living and working conditions. The provisions of the Mexican agreement include a minimum wage of not less than 30 cents an hour, housing standards and collective bargaining for their nationals. These standards were likewise extended to domestic agricultural workers transported more than 200 miles by the government.

If this bill becomes law, the food program for 1943 will be further jeopardized. The Agricultural Extension Service operates on a county level through county agents and is incapable of recruiting farm labor for transportation to labor-shortage areas. Likewise the county agents are usually officials of the Farm Bureau and are often paid jointly by funds appropriated by the County Farm Bureau, the state and federal governments.

H. L. MITCHELL, Executive Secretary,
Memphis, Tenn. Southern Tenant Farmers' Union

Long Books and Long Letters

SIR: I take issue with Mr. Malcolm Cowley in your March 29 number, not as to the length of ephemeral books but in his inclusion of such a work as Alden Brooks's "Will Shakspere and the Dyer's Hand." I doubt whether, if Mr. Cowley had read that book through, he would be able to brush it off as he has done. It is very much more than an attempt to "prove indisputably for the ninety-eighth time," etc. It is an important work. We look to a paper like The New Republic to detect important works. We can get flip book notices in the daily press.

The thesis of "Will Shakspere and the Dyer's Hand" was first broached in Alden Brooks's "Will Shakspere, Factotum and Agent," in 1937, when this deponent read it and thought it had a decent argument. The amount of evidence adduced and the necessity of quoting the sources makes the book (the recent one) longer than it would have been otherwise. . . . I maintain Mr. Brooks has a theme of intense interest to all literary men and especially critics and writers of imaginative literature. . . .

Speaking of length, Mr. Cowley's attention is invited to pages 415-16 of your paper. I find that no less than two and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a quarter columns are taken up with details of Marlowe, Fletcher and other contemporaries of Shakespeare. Evidently it is of interest. I certainly find it so. I hope you give us more of it. It makes me wonder once more whether Mr. Cowley has read the Alden Brooks book. I commend it to him. I reviewed it and found it far more enthralling than a so-called "thriller."

Brookfield, Conn. WILLIAM MCFEE

SIR: When I read your review of Freeman's novel "Never Call Retreat" [March 22] I was inclined to agree with you that a considerable portion of it was excess baggage and that judicious pruning would have made it a more effective piece of writing. But again the same may be said of a number of novels of acknowledged distinction. "War and Peace" would certainly not suffer if most of the minute examination of Napoleon's strategy and the careful description of the Masonic ritual were eliminated; or "The Magic Mountain" if the interminable philosophic discourses were deleted; or "The Thibaults" if the extensive debate on socialist tactics were omitted. However, this is a matter of taste and literary judgment.

I do feel, though, that it was ill advised for you to use "Never Call Retreat" as Exhibit A in exemplification of your argument that recent books have been too long and that they have been so by reason of commercial expediency. Certainly Freeman's novel doesn't belong in the same category as "Anthony Adverse" and "G. W. T. W." Even you conceded that, once unpacked, the story Freeman tells has a tragic power that is rare in our times. Surely a writer capable of telling such a story is not apt to be swayed by commercial considerations when they are likely to conflict with its intended scheme and effect. Isn't it enough if we criticize Freeman's artistic judgment without calling his integrity into question? . . .

By the way, if it is so urgent to conserve paper, how come The New Republic could afford to spare three columns for the quibbling and innuendo of Mr. Bakeless and Mr. Levin? Or do you feel that the authentication of Marlowe's apocryphal remarks is of immediate interest to your readers?

A. H. BERMAN

Indianapolis, Ind.

Concentration Camps in North Africa

SIR: Your readers may be interested in the enclosed copy of a letter just received from a recent prisoner in a concentration camp in North Africa.

New York City J. H.

[ENCLOSURE]

. . . Although the camps at Boghar and Saida have been emptied (except for the Spaniards), nothing has yet been done for Djelfa, the camp of political internees. In this camp are kept many long-time anti-Fascists (fighters in the Spanish civil war, political refugees, etc.) who were fighting Hitler or his vassals at a time when those who are guarding them were still kissing Hitler's boots.

The camp at Djelfa, moreover, badly lacks food, clothing and medical attendants. In 1941 and 1942 more than fifty men died of typhus there. The inmates have suffered the harsh discipline of the director, a 100-percent Vichy man.

Nothing has been changed since the arrival of the Americans and British. There are the same men in control—Nazi sympathizers—the same criticism of the democracies, the same bad treatment of those considered political enemies. A commission, including an American and a British officer, came to Djelfa on January 23, making large promises; but thus far, these promises have not been realized. . . .

Monsignor Ryan

SIR: The letter of Leo H. Lehmann [April 5] concerning Mgr. John A. Ryan is so flagrantly unjust in its implications that it hardly requires a serious answer.

Over forty years of intense work in the field of sociology and economics, forty years in which Monsignor Ryan has gained an international reputation for clarity of vision, forcefulness of reasoning, and earnest devotion to the cause of justice and human dignity—these forty years and more render him immune from the petty attacks of small men.

In his work on "The State and the Church" Monsignor Ryan discussed the wholly hypothetical situation of a country which becomes almost entirely Catholic. It has no relevance to any foreseeable actual situation. For that matter, a Catholic country like Eire today offers sounder protection to Protestant groups than a non-Catholic region like Ulster offers to its Catholic minority.

The Brooklyn Tablet has a political side and a religious side. Monsignor Ryan would no more be found endorsing the former than he would think of questioning the strict orthodoxy of the latter.

Notre Dame, Ind. FRANCIS E. MCMAHON

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Commendation for David Ginsburg of the OPA (T. R. B.'s report of March 22) comes from John O. Levinson of Chicago, Illinois. "The report on the smearing of David Ginsburg," writes Mr. Levinson, "was a more than adequate stricture on the most cowardly bit of congressional exhibitionism I have yet witnessed. Both socially and as the occupant of a lowly rung on the OPA ladder, I've known Dave Ginsburg well, though not intimately, for about two years. A brilliant and constructive lawyer possessed of real social vision, cultured, articulate, poised, genuinely modest, and withal and above all a 'right guy,' he combines in himself not only, as he put it, many political handicaps, but also and more important still, all the attributes which spell leadership of the best kind. With two possible exceptions he is, in my opinion, head and shoulders above any man of our generation in Washington today. Few will be found who know him who would not gladly have their sons, or for that matter themselves, under Dave Ginsburg in or out of the army."

Szymon St. Deptula, of the University of Wisconsin, writes from Milwaukee to complain sharply of The New Republic's treatment of the Russian-Polish boundary dispute. Mr. Deptula thinks that the Soviet Union intends to annex half of Poland and says that this is "territory that never belonged to her except under the partitions. . . . This sort of unilateral action at the expense of Russia's weaker neighbors is imperialism of the rankest sort. . . . The majority of the people of eastern Poland are Catholics, not Communists or atheists; their absorption by Soviet Russia would mean in addition to deprivation of freedom of speech and the introduction of government by fear . . . also the deprivation of freedom of religion. . . . Isn't all this talk of 'strategic frontiers' more or less obsolete in this day of air power and two-ton block-busters? If we are all going to reshape the post-war world according to a live-and-let-live political philosophy, Russia then need not fear her weaker neighbors whom she is so intent on absorbing and communizing under one pretext or another any more than her neighbors should have to live in constant dread of invasion and attack from within by the Communist fifth column represented by the Red party members wherever the Comintern has its agents. It is a sad commentary on the post-war ambitions of our ally that she is still looking for more countries to conquer under the guise of seeking more 'strategic frontiers' for herself."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Last Man Around the World

ANY FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT who loves his job would have given an arm, an eye or a wife for the chance of making a trip like Wendell Willkie's. Last fall he traveled 31,000 miles in an army bomber, crossing the equator twice and visiting all three of the major battle-fronts. He spent a night and a day with General Montgomery, who told him that Rommel's defeat was mathematically certain—and this at a moment when almost everybody else thought that Egypt was lost. He had two private interviews with Stalin, besides a state dinner at which Stalin guffawed at his jokes. Roosevelt wouldn't let him go to India, but in China he spent six days with the Gissimo and the Missimo, talking or listening most of the time. After such a trip round the world in forty-nine days, you can imagine the story that Sheean or Whitaker would have told.

And you feel that Willkie himself, in other circumstances, would have made a first-class reporter. He proves as much in the chapter of "One World" [1] that describes his visit to the Republic of Yakutsk, so far from the firing line that there was no reason to conceal anything he saw or heard. In this chapter, besides paying a tribute to the Russians as pioneers, he suggests one aspect of Russian communism that American Communists have refused to recognize. The president of the Yakutian Council of People's Commissars was taking him to the theatre, but they spent a long time talking after dinner, and at last Willkie asked him when the show started. "Mr. Willkie," he answered like a reigning prince, "the show starts when I get there." But if Stalin made any remarks that were equally revealing, they had to be treated as diplomatic secrets. Almost the only new facts Willkie tells us about him are that he is extremely tired, that he greatly admires Winston Churchill and that his famous tunics are dyed a soft green or a delicate pink. The picture of Chiang Kai-shek is colorless; and in fact the whole book is somewhat lacking in specific details. Yet it succeeds in telling us a great deal about the present world, as well as a great deal about Wendell Willkie; and it deserves to be carefully read for both reasons.

What it tells us about the man himself is that he belongs to an American type now somewhat rarer than it used to be: the small-town boy who came up in the world, but without losing his friendly curiosity or his democratic feeling that people everywhere should have the same opportunity for making good. I always get uneasy when I hear poets and politicians talking about American democracy, because I feel that so far as it really exists—and it does exist, for all our shortcomings—it is something we didn't work to acquire. When we boast about it, we might as well be saying, "I inherited a million dollars from my great-grandfather Jefferson," when all the time we were busy wasting the money that we had done absolutely nothing to earn. But in this book, Willkie shows us a more appealing side of American democracy: the underlying notion that fixed classes are wrong, that people are pretty much alike in all countries and that they ought to be good neighbors, just as they were in Ellwood, Indiana.

Willkie himself has an amazing talent for friendliness with all sorts of people, including dictators, flying officers and Polish waitresses. He listens to them sympathetically, and usually gives them the impression that he agrees with what they are saying. But he remains a pretty hard-headed customer, and I doubt that anybody during the whole trip sold him a bill of goods. I can see no merit whatever in the argument that Willkie is a lawyer presenting a brief for two lease-lend clients, Russia and China. Forrest Davis, who offered the argument, is the man who lately presented a very able and one-sided brief for the State Department. On the other hand Willkie expresses a reasonably low opinion of the Department's policies in North Africa and Europe. When attacking him, Davis ought to make it clear that he himself is an attorney for the defense of the nearly indefensible.

Far from speaking as a lawyer in this book, Willkie seems to be a man following his naturally sound instincts; I would say "intuition" if Hitler hadn't discredited the word. He seems to feel rather than think his way forward, by a process not always apparent in his writing. Possibly it depends on the storing up in his mind of details that he does not consciously remember, or does not regard as important enough to be mentioned in his story—but finally they accumulate and force him toward an overwhelming conclusion. To mention one example, Willkie gives a fairly optimistic account of conditions in China, but the reader notes one significant fact. It was in Chungking, not Moscow, that he issued his statement attacking Western imperialism and saying that "we as a nation have not made up our minds what kind of world we want to speak for when victory comes." In Chungking he came to feel, by a process he does not wholly explain—but it must have been valid, since it led him, there and elsewhere, to valid statements of policy—that political events were turning badly for the United Nations.

When Willkie ran for President in 1940, some of his following was pretty undesirable. It included American imperialists and America Firsters, not to mention pro-Nazis, whom he did his best to discourage. For the most part, however, it consisted of honest people with the Chamberlain mentality, which is not confined to England or to the upper classes. Since every President must come to terms with his own supporters, Willkie's election in 1940 would have been a defeat for the ideas he has come to represent. Today he is exactly 128 years ahead of the State Department. He is advancing a political program for the present war and the peace that will follow it, whereas the State Department is laying well considered plans for the Congress of Vienna. MALCOLM COWLEY

[1] One World, by Wendell L. Willkie. New York: Simon and Schuster. 216 pages. Paper, $1; cloth, $2.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Woman Doctor's Odyssey

Exploring the Dangerous Trades, by Alice Hamilton, M.D. Atlantic Monthly Press Book. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 433 pages. $3.

WHEN BENVENUTO CELLINI set about writing the now famous autobiography he voiced as justification the thought that "All men, of whatsoever quality they be, who have done anything of excellence ought, if they are persons of truth and honesty, to describe their life with their own hand." Despite the intensely interesting story of his life and exploits, many historians question whether Cellini himself fully met the requirements either as to high accomplishment or truthfulness. But none will challenge Dr. Alice Hamilton's possession of these qualifications.

"Exploring the Dangerous Trades" is the absorbing story of a very great woman who had the courage and the vision to step out of the sheltered atmosphere of the laboratory and, practically alone and unaided, established in America at least, the modern science of industrial hygiene. No one can say how many persons now living owe their lives to the persistent and painstaking explorations of Dr. Alice Hamilton, but the number must be very large. Even today, more than thirty years since this gentle but purposeful medico first exposed the hazards of toxic dusts, gases and fumes, then prevalent but completely ignored in our industrial operations, death and serious illness from work exposures still are everyday occurrences. But the toll is nothing to be compared with that which prevailed in 1910, and went unnoticed by the medical profession, unheeded by management and stoically accepted by workers as inevitable.

Although Dr. Hamilton is a technician and scientist of the first rank, her story is not one of the laboratory alone but one of intense human interest. She describes her explorations into mines, mills and other work places where she came face to face with workers suffering from the effects of benzol, lead, carbon disulphide, silica dust and many other dangerous substances. In vivid and realistic terms Dr. Hamilton tells how and where she saw dead fingers on living stonecutters, talked with human canaries and met up with mad hatters, victims of spastic anemia, of picric acid and of mercury poisoning respectively.

The picture of this quiet, soft-spoken woman, standing up to belligerent, antagonistic employers and calmly insisting upon remedial action in controlling health hazards is an inspiring testimonial of what can be accomplished when exact knowledge is fortified by courage, zeal and persistence.

But the story of dangerous trades is not the only gripping feaure of Dr. Hamilton's "life by her own hand." Her intense interest in social betterment generally, stimulated by contact with Jane Addams, is revealed in every chapter from Hull House to Hadlyme. The pursuit of her ideals of peace through the years took her to the Vatican, the Kremlin, the Hague, to Geneva and to many of the capitals of the world. In these excursions Dr. Hamilton occupied the dual roles of medical scientist and trained sociologist. In neither of these, however, does she attempt to be profound or dogmatic. Whether she is relating her part in scientific conferences or telling of her contacts with the famous personages of the period she does so in terms of characteristic simplicity. "Exploring the Dangerour Trades" is a work of permanent and enduring value.

FRANCES PERKINS

Parkman and Literature

Francis Parkman: Heroic Historian, by Mason Wade. New York: The Viking Press. 466 pages, illustrated. $4.50.

A BIOGRAPHY is bound to have shortcomings if it is undertaken without a clear idea of the significance of its subject. Mr. Wade's life of Parkman has many merits. It includes an abundance of fresh material and gives a richer record than we have so far possessed of Parkman's wander years. Nor does Mr. Wade's book shun the problems of interpretation. Yet, taken as a whole, it leaves us with a marked impression of inadequacy both as biography and as evaluation. For Mr. Wade's biography is written without the least suspicion that Parkman, eminent as he may have been as an historian, was primarily a great literary figure, one of the greatest in our annals, a figure who stands with Melville and Hawthorne as one of our few major masters of tragedy. The result is a little as if one should undertake a life of Milton, say, aware of "Paradise Lost" only as a massive, original and exceptionally well written venture into theology.

Parkman, Mr. Wade says in his introduction, has a claim to our attention on three grounds: as the greatest of our historical writers, as the last and greatest of the Brahmins and as a great personality. When one has finished Mr. Wade's book one finds oneself doubtful whether the last is true at all in the sense Mr. Wade intends, unimpressed with the second as a claim to real greatness, and dissatisfied with the first as an explanation of the kind of greatness that keeps Parkman's work alive today. In short, one wonders, on Mr. Wade's showing, whether Parkman really does make an imperative demand on our attention. The central biographical fact about Parkman Mr. Wade nowhere seems to grasp—the fact that Parkman was, not simply a great historical writer, but a great writer *tout court*, a genuine creator. Missing his fundamental point, he inevitably fumbles when he attempts to evaluate Parkman's career and achievements.

Take, for instance, Mr. Wade's treatment of Parkman's Brahminism, that complex of attitudes and beliefs that was perhaps the most conspicuous element in his character. As Mr. Wade points out, Brahminism narrowed Parkman's range of interests and distorted his judgment of events. It gave him as a young man a tiresomely inflated sense of social superiority and in later years led him into a quixotic series of forays against manhood suffrage and other manifestations of political democracy. All his life he was consumed by a frustrated hunger for leadership, which he felt the tenets of equality made impossible for his class. (His letters to the newspapers during the Civil War return again and again to this theme.)

Yet, having established this much, Mr. Wade is at a loss to know what further to make of Parkman's Brahminism, for which, as a personal trait, he obviously feels little sympathy. Seeking to make something of it, he comes back in his last chapter with singular inconsequence to the thesis of his introduction. The enduring worth of Parkman's writ-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings, he concludes, "entitles him to recognition not only as the last but the greatest of that caste which has set its stamp on our way of life." This is an empty peroration. As "the last of the Brahmins" Parkman is entitled to about as much recognition as Fisher Ames, the last of the Federalists, or other New England antiques of the same model—which is to say, in the general American scheme of things, about a short footnote's worth. In itself, Parkman's Brahminism has merely the interest of local color, of the odd and the minor—a fact of which Mr. Wade himself is uneasily aware throughout most of his book. But, not realizing that Parkman was before all else a writer, a man, that is to say, whose ideas and attitudes are primarily significant only as the stuff out of which the imagination molds and shapes a work of art, Mr. Wade naturally falls into phrase-making when he tries to bring Parkman's Brahminism into relation with his achievement.

In Parkman the creative spirit breathed for once upon a Brahmin even as it sometimes breathes upon non-Brahmins: the important point about Parkman's Brahminism is what, as a writer, Parkman made of it in his work. It is out of this unpromising material, the sorry stuff of Boston obsolescence and frustrated caste-feeling, that Parkman fashioned, for instance, the character of La Salle, the greatest of his historical portraits. Parkman's La Salle is a tragic hero cast in the classic mold, the man of superb endowments brought to his destruction by one fatal defect. Some flaw of temperament, a sort of haughty reserve ("often unsympathetic and always seeming so, smothering emotions which he could not utter, schooled to universal distrust"), cut him off from men and prevented him from winning to himself the kind of devoted following he needed to prosecute successfully his magnificently conceived enterprises. He fell at last, slain by one of his own band.

The tragedy of La Salle is a tragedy of leadership, the tragedy of the leader without followers. It is precisely the tragedy of Parkman and his class. Into it Parkman distilled the feeling of the Brahmin caste, apt for command yet reduced to impotence (the hope of restoration kindled for a moment by the Civil War had died away), and of his own balked craving for high place in a life of action and affairs. Yet the portrait is a work of art, a rendering sure, superb, unsentimentalized, of greatness in defeat, like all true works of art at once expressing and transcending the local phenomena—Brahminism and Parkman's private emotions—in which it takes its origins. Parkman's La Salle stands beside Melville's Ahab (different as Parkman's manner is from Melville's) as one of the finest embodiments of the tragic vision to be found in our literature. To write, as Mr. Wade does, a life of Parkman without mentioning Parkman's portrait of La Salle is like writing a life of Milton without mentioning Satan or Samson.

The same lack of perception marks Mr. Wade's handling of other aspects of Parkman's work. In the struggle which was the subject of his history Parkman's sympathies were divided: he disliked equally absolutism, Catholicism, Puritanism and New England commercialism. The question of what Parkman's attitude toward the contending parties of his narrative really was is a complicated one. To a consideration of it Mr. Wade brings prepossessions that allow him to dismiss Parkman's anti-clericalism as an "obsession"; the complexities of the question he resolves in terms of a facile dichotomy of heart and head—heart with Canada, head with New England. But it is not mainly Mr. Wade's Catholic point of view that causes his easy exegesis to seem so lacking in penetration; again it is his failure to take into account the all-important fact that Parkman was a writer, that above everything else he saw his subject in terms of the dramatic imagination. Mr. Wade's thesis raises immediately dozens of questions in the mind of anyone who has read Parkman's history as a work of literature. Are, for instance, the pages that chronicle with fierce, scarcely concealed partisanship the massacres of New England settlers by the Indian allies of the French or the paragraphs that describe the jubilation of New England at the fall of Quebec, written any less from the heart than the warmly colored portraits of martyred Jesuits or figures such as Montcalm or Frontenac? Does one find in Parkman any trace of that exquisite but sickly nostalgia which pervades a book like "Shadows on the Rock"—a book dealing with Parkman's own subject and inspired by the same kind of sympathy which Mr. Wade ascribes to Parkman? A conflict of heart and head such as Mr. Wade suggests usually leaves marks on a writer's style and can be traced in the handling of his subject matter. Where in Parkman do we find these stigmata? Does the conflict blur the outline of the work or has the artist resolved it in the work? Mr. Wade's thesis may or may not be defensible. But of the issues it raises and of the terms in which it can profitably be discussed Mr. Wade seems completely unaware.

One should say in postscript that the shortcomings of Mr. Wade's biography cannot be laid entirely on his own shoulders. Parkman has been almost wholly neglected by students of American literature. An adequate biography of a writer is impossible without a background of scholarly and critical analysis. There is no tradition of Parkman studies in American literary scholarship or of Parkman criticism in American letters. As long as this gap is unfilled, it is not surprising that a biographer should conceive as the proper manner for a life of Parkman the manner (excellent for its purposes) of M. A. De Wolfe Howe writing on, say, Thomas Sergeant Perry. HOWARD N. DOUGHTY JR.

Man of Magic

George Washington Carver: An American Biography, by Rackham Holt. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 342 pages. $3.50.

EIGHTY YEARS after the Emancipation Proclamation, Rackham Holt's sympathetic story of the career of George Washington Carver brings to a close the cycle of up-from-slavery biographies which, beginning with the narratives of fugitive slaves, have been a distinct genre in American letters for more than a century. Last of the slave-born to achieve distinction in American life, Dr. Carver was born on a Missouri farm, his birth date unrecorded, and died January 5, 1943, at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, where for forty-seven years he had labored, winning fame as an agricultural chemist and contributing, in his way, to the improvement of race relations.

The story of his spectacular rise, of the wonders which he performed with the soil and products of Alabama, of his influence upon Southern agriculture, of his humility,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selflessness and religious fervor, and of his efforts to better race relations in the Deep South has been recounted in many newspaper and magazine articles through which he became widely known as the "wizard of Tuskegee," a man of magic. It remained, however, for Mrs. Holt to give us the first integrated story of his life and work—a fitting companion piece to Booker T. Washington's autobiography, "Up from Slavery." The author has engaged in no "debunking." Indeed, she approaches her subject with something of reverence and develops his life story with that loving tenderness which Dr. Carver was peculiarly able to evoke, particularly from white admirers. Her work, nevertheless, is not the mere effusion of an ardent admirer. It is a well conceived and readable volume, the result of diligent research and competent workmanship. Moreover, it reveals an understanding of the basic social and economic factors which have retarded the development of the South.

"George Washington Carver" is more than a biography of an individual. It is also the story of the founding and growth of Tuskegee Institute, of Booker T. Washington's life work, of the economic life and social customs of the Deep South, all of which influenced Dr. Carver's career. While his work, in turn, helped influence the economic life of the region, its impact upon social customs was negligible. Even within the shadow of Tuskegee Institute, these restrictive customs remain unchanged and seldom challenged.

"Dr. Carver's primary aim since coming to Tuskegee," the author writes, "had been to lighten the appalling misery he saw about him by relieving the poverty of the South—to substitute for the destroying one-crop system of cotton the two lifesavers which could most easily be fitted into the Southern agrarian economy—peanuts and sweet potatoes." These two products, he maintained, could replace all other vegetable foodstuffs in the human diet. In his laboratory at Tuskegee, he developed from the peanut some 300 products—foods, oils, paints, plastics; from the sweet potato, 118 products; from the native clays of Alabama, useful dyes; from waste materials, a variety of substitutes for needed products. He was a pioneer in the dehydration of foods, advocating it long before its present popularity.

Mrs. Holt credits him with profound influence upon Southern agriculture. In 1896 when he arrived at Tuskegee, the peanut had not even been recognized as a crop. "Now it was among the leading six in the entire United States. . . . By 1940 it was the second Southern cash crop after cotton; and five million acres were allotted in 1942." Though he was little interested in the commercialization of his products, Dr. Carver believed that his discoveries would ultimately find popular use.

The author only obliquely indicates the skepticism among scientists, many of whom regarded Dr. Carver more as a concoctionist than a contributor to scientific knowledge, and looked askance upon God as a collaborator in the laboratory. Nor does Mrs. Holt fully comprehend why certain Negroes were critical of her subject. Their attitude was not, as she seems to think, motivated by envy of his success nor disdain for his eccentricities and unkempt appearance. Rather, it was because of his humility. In manner and appearance, he was indistinguishable from the stereotype plantation Negro. It was just this quality which endeared him to white folk. They felt at home with him. To them, he was the perfect example of the Negro whom education had not "spoiled." He had intelligence, perhaps genius; yet he was humble. He would ride up in the freight elevator in a hotel and wait in an anteroom until the banquet was over in order to deliver the message which might mean salvation to white planters. They rewarded him with fulsome praise.

He was the ideal vehicle for spreading what is called "good will" among Southern whites. He was the kind of Negro they could listen to without feeling that their privileged status was challenged. He was not, however, the man to inspire the Negro today in the struggle for democratic equalization. Even in the field of science, Negro youth finds more inspiration in the scholarly and little publicized work of Ernest E. Just, the biologist, than in the amazing career of the magic man of Tuskegee.

HENRY LEE MOON

John Cheever's Stories

The Way Some People Live, by John Cheever. New York: Random House. 256 pages. $2.

In 1930, when he was seventeen, John Cheever severed his connections with an Eastern preparatory school, and not long afterwards appeared in this magazine with a sensitive and precocious account of the institution in which he had been a most unhappy student. It was a very promising piece of work. Cheever went on to publish stories at infrequent intervals in the little magazines of the early nineteen-thirties; but it was not until The New Yorker, shrewdly detecting a writer of talent, took him up only a few years ago that he suddenly displayed an unexpected knack for rapidly turning out neatly tailored sketches for that magazine, most of them acid accounts of pathos in the suburbs.

As examples of fiction from The New Yorker, these stories of Mr. Cheever's are among the best that have appeared there recently, and this is particularly true of those which exploit a cool and narrow-eyed treatment of tensions arising from the war. Mr. Cheever's drunken draft-dodger and his young draftee are particularly well managed, and the sketches in which they appear are quite unblemished by the pieties and embarrassments which ordinarily mark war fiction published while a war is on. Many of the other stories—and if my count is right, all but six of the thirty included here are from The New Yorker—have not improved by their being collected in a book. As individual magazine stories they seemed better than they are; read one after another, their nearly identical lengths, similarities of tone and situation, and their somehow remote and unambitious style, produce an effect of sameness and eventually of tedium. The formula has been flourished too obviously and too often.

Mr. Cheever is not alone. He bathes in that same large municipal pool where all New Yorker short-story writers swim and sink. As Lionel Trilling remarked, one feels that almost any one of them might write another's story. Their characters live in an identical and tidy world which the magazine's editors have laboriously created by a set

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tone and by an elaborate hierarchy of taboos. It is a milieu which the writers stray from only at their peril. From Mr. Cheever's bleak suburban homes to Sally Benson's nurseries, or to John O'Hara's night clubs (Chicago, Hollywood and New York), or to Edward Newhouse's bars, it is only a step. The reader need scarcely move. Few magazines of the time have had so bright and professional an air, and fewer others have attained so high a level of general skill in their prose. But it is skill expended on what is more often than not the essentially trivial; it would even seem that the magazine's character demands a patina of triviality spread over those themes and situations which its policy allows. Its writers must frequently entertain themselves by concentrating on the merely decorative qualities of a scene, a restriction brought on by an understandable hesitancy to explore their material deeply. Thus, in such a story as Mr. Cheever's "Forever Hold Your Peace," the exhaustively reported small talk of guests at a wedding performs the services of a more consequential and telling method of viewing the situation.

Some of Mr. Cheever's best stories, which were written during his less fettered pre-New Yorker phase—particularly "The Teaser" and "The Princess," which came out in this magazine some years ago, and "Behold a Cloud in the West," from New Letters—have been mysteriously omitted. So have a number of others that would stand up better than many that are here. But one long story, "Of Love: A Testimony," which is seven or eight years old, has been retained. It is an excellent example of what this writer is capable of doing when he is his own man, when he has room enough in which to work for something more than episodic notation and minor perceptive effects.

WELDON KEES

A Reader's List

WE CAN WIN THIS WAR, by Col. W. F. Kernan (Little, Brown, $1.50). Colonel Kernan repeats the thesis of his earlier book that defense will not win the war. To Italy as a possible invasion point, Kernan adds the Aegean and Salonika, the Adriatic and Austria, and Toulon and Southern France. This little book—it is no more than a pamphlet interlarded with historical analogy and theological disputation—is chiefly valuable perhaps in its negative aspects in which we are warned to take the Guadalcanal and North African campaigns only for what they are worth. Kernan's style is as noisy and noisome as in his earlier book, and his slap-dash metaphors are frequently in downright bad taste ("the sanctity which can throw a spiritual 'natural' every time we roll the dice of destiny").

PARATROOPS, by Major F. O. Miksche (Random, $2.50). A comprehensive analysis of the specific problems and functions of air-borne troops as an adjunct of ground forces. For the lay reader, familiar only with the many interpretative books about the war, this volume is a revela-

Better than YOUR OWN Summer Home!

Here at COPAKE is a complete summer home that solves all the problems — no taxes — wear and tear or depreciation to worry about. One low cost and a modern fully equipped bungalow is yours for an entire season. Complete sanitary conveniences. Provisions delivered to door. Entire family may participate in all adult camp activities, including free season golf pass; children entitled to Junior camp facilities (separate from adults) all at no extra cost.

Write for illustrated booklet:
N. Y. office—152 West 42nd St.
CHickering 4-1668

COPAKE COUNTRY CLUB
CRARYVILLE, N.Y.

Maplehurst RANCH

Spend Your Vacation at the MAPLEHURST RANCH
50 miles from Grand Central
Everything tops—Riding, Instruction, tennis, swimming and all sports on Ranch grounds free. No discrimination. Write direct to Ranch or phone Croton Falls 969 or "Ask Mr Foster Service."
CROTON FALLS, N. Y.

A VACATION HAVEN 40 MILES FROM N. Y.
Birdland
CENTRAL VALLEY N. Y.
Formerly Lewisohn's Estate OPEN ALL YEAR
225-acre estate of fascinating hiking country. Tennis, Golf, Handball, Bicycles, Ping-pong, Games, recordings, library, dancing. Open fireplaces. Excellent cuisine. Every comfort. Incomparable surroundings. Tel: Highland Hills 7895. Your Hostess: FANNIE GOLDBERG

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE ON POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION
First Series of Conferences on Full Employment and Minimum Living Standards . . . 11 Successive Wednesday evenings at 8 P.M.

Subject of April 21st Conference
RELIGION and MATERIAL SECURITY
Single admission, 75¢
Auditorium, Education Building
Greene and West Fourth Streets, near Washington Square East

The Speakers . . .

DR. LOUIS J. FINKELSTEIN
President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America

REV. FRANCIS J. McCONNELL
Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church; former President of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America

MONSIGNOR JOHN A. RYAN
former Professor of Moral Philosophy and Industrial Ethics, Catholic University of America

For full particulars about this conference and the entire series of conferences, address The Director, Institute on Postwar Reconstruction, New York University, Washington Square, New York . . . or telephone SPring 7-2000, Ext. 270.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of military thinking: blunt, humorless, pointed. From the very brief history of air-borne troops, Major Miksche draws the significant lessons that must be applied to their present and future use. Questions of training, distribution, equipment, communication, etc., are treated in a detailed and systematic fashion. Finding military science at a "doctrinal cross roads" in which various techniques are hotly espoused or discounted, the author argues that ultimate victory must necessarily be won by "continental" fighting methods. To this end he urges the recognition of the primary importance of ground warfare, aided, not supplanted by the air arm.

PLANNING: Two Hundredth Issue (Political and Economic Planning, available from The New Republic, 25 cents). The pamphlet summarizes briefly the work of the British PEP group since 1931. This booklet does not present a study of a specific question as do the others in the series, but its references to many of the earlier studies will make it useful to those who are following the ideas of this group. It offers impressive testimony to the originality of thought which has characterized the organization and to the value of the "fact-finding" attitude which has been basic in all its reports.

PLANNING: British Foreign Policy (Political and Economic Planning, available from The New Republic, 25 cents). Number 201 of the series. In its early days, PEP concentrated on domestic rather than international problems: "planning should begin at home." The war has changed the perspective here, as elsewhere. This pamphlet surveys Britain's strength and weakness for the new era of internationalism and suggests the main principles on which British foreign policy should be founded.

THE INTERNATIONAL STEEL CARTEL, by Ervin Hexner (North Carolina, $6). Dr. Hexner's study of the Steel Cartel is a well documented and judicious analysis of one of the most powerful and yet least known of the pre-war international industrial combines. The complex and often bewildering structure of the cartel, which was based upon a loose alliance of numerous national and individual export groups, is carefully dissected, and its attempts to control world markets are effectively described. Although Dr. Hexner underestimates the baneful political influence of the cartel, he points out that we may be able to adapt its type of organization for socially useful purposes after the war. Post-war planners should not ignore this worthwhile suggestion.

COLONEL EFFINGHAM'S RAID, by Berry Fleming (Duell, Sloan and Pearce, $2.50). Willy Seaborn Effingham, Colonel, U. S. Army, retired, comes back to Fredericksville, Georgia, his home town, unwilling to spend his waning days in idleness. He thereupon begins writing a column of war commentary for the local newspaper, and soon finds himself involved in city politics, bucking the political machine. All of this makes a convenient analogue for portraying the fight for democracy on the home front. You get the idea, but the novel is never up to its own potential. The local political machine, for all the author's efforts, can think of nothing more corrupt than changing the name of the town square, and tearing down the old courthouse in order to replace it with a new one. Colonel Effingham is meant to embody the democratic conscience, but all too often the gentleman of the Old South who models aged whiskey on the billboards stands in for him. The style of the book, which has prevented the emergence of a single sentence written in modest English, is an affected melange of Confederate history and the Manual of Arms. A Book-of-the-Month-Club selection for March.

MR. TIBBS PASSES THROUGH, by Robert Neumann (Dutton, $2.50). A novel with a realistic background and fantastic characters, centering around a family which moves from a bombed city to an about-to-be-bombed village. The plot is episodic and slender, depending entirely on the characters. Because of the schizophrenic opposition of the nature of the characters against the nature of the setting, and also because Mr. Neumann, unhindered by the fact that this is his first book in English, is sometimes carried away by his own stylistic facility, the book has moments of sounding like "Dear Brutus" played in a shell hole. Yet at best it has a kind of queer, almost gruesomely illuminated quality that gives it a place as a serious war allegory.

Contributors

SIR BERNARD PARES, British historian and philologist, is an outstanding authority on Russia and has made twenty-six visits to that country in forty years. He is head of Slavonic and East European Studies at London University and editor of The Slavonic Review. Among his books are "History of Russia," "The Fall of the Russian Monarchy" and "Russia," which sold 250,000 copies in Britain and has just been published by Penguin Books in the United States.

CARROLL KILPATRICK is the Washington correspondent of The Birmingham News and Age-Herald.

SALLY LEE WOODALL is a graduate of Birmingham-Southern College and has done graduate work at Columbia University and the Feagin School of Drama. She has been on the New York stage and has written many radio and advertising scripts.

FRANCES PERKINS is the Secretary of Labor.

HOWARD DOUGHTY JR. is a member of the department of English at the University of Pennsylvania and has published reviews and essays in The New York Herald Tribune Books, Hound and Horn and elsewhere.

HENRY LEE MOON is a Racial Relations adviser for a federal agency. He has been assistant to the secretary of Tuskegee Institute and an editorial writer on Negro newspapers in Cleveland, Ohio, and New York City. He has contributed to The New Republic, The Nation, The New York Times, Phylon, Opportunity and The Crisis.

WELDON KEES, now living in New York, is a frequent contributor to The New Republic, Poetry, Partisan Review and other magazines. He is the author of a book of poems, "The Last Man," which is soon to be published by The Colt Press.

BOOKS

The Story of an American Sailor Aboard a Death Ship

The most exciting and sensational sea story of this time. Unexpurgated and unabridged edition. Cloth bound. Library size. Of the eighteen editions already printed this is the only authentic one. Two dollars (U. S. Cy.) No cash permitted, only postal orders or checks. (The plates of the book have been turned over to the U. S. Govt. There will be no new printing for the duration.)

CASA M. L. MARTINEZ
Apartado 2528 Mexico City

WANTED TO BUY

LINGUAPHONE. Any language, any make. Indicate condition, language, number of records and books. LANGUAGE Room 1203 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

LITERARY SERVICE

TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable results. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Order your books — all books mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th St., New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak

Charter for America

A Special Section

Introduction

ON MARCH 10, 1943, President Roosevelt submitted to Congress for its consideration a report of the National Resources Planning Board. That report embodied a plan for a post-war America which is gradually coming to be known as the "American Charter." Its original title was formal and prosaic—"National Resources Development—Report for 1943, Part I. Post-War Plan and Program," with an exhaustive supporting technical document on "Security, Work and Relief Policies." And the reception that Congress and the press have thus far given it has also been not only prosaic but practically non-existent. Yet the American Charter has in it the possibilities, if they are used right, for playing in the post-war period of the 1940's the role that the New Deal played in the depression period of the 1930's.

To understand its larger meanings we must see it as the point at which converge four streams of tendency or lines of direction.

I. *Economic Thinking.* – The report was not spun out overnight from the innards of any man or group of men. It is the culmination of a considerable history of economic thinking, research and investigation in this country and in England. The basic idea of that thinking is the idea of the maximum use and development of the resources of the nation, and of achieving full employment and security. This idea comes partly from the socialist tradition. But in America and England it has had a native and on the whole non-socialist development in the thinking of men like Thorstein Veblen, John A. Hobson, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Lord Keynes and Alvin H. Hansen. These men have taken an approach to the economic problem that has not been dogmatic in the sense of the rejection or espousal of any "system," but has been rather an engineering one. They have, by and large, asked what resources in men and material wealth we have, and how those resources can best be organized to achieve the social goals that the sense of the whole community regards as desirable.

The New Deal was itself an episode in this development, although it was a feverish and fumbling and terribly imperfect one. It was a crisis program. But ever since 1937 and 1938 our economists have been doing some thinking about long-range economic development. The TNEC (Temporary National Economic Committee), made up of representatives of certain strategic administrative agencies and of congressmen, did some valuable research and investigation, holding hearings and issuing useful monographs on various phases of our economic life. And the National Resources Planning Board has similarly been doing research and thinking for some five years on this general subject.

II. *Political Warfare.* – It has long been recognized that men fight best when they have something beyond themselves to fight for. When a man dies, he wants to die for something important. And when a man has to work hard, and stretch himself to the utmost capacity of production, he also wants it to be for something important. As the members of the board put it in the letter with which they transmit the report to the President:

> We need to see more and more clearly the kind of world toward which we are headed in order to maintain the fighting spirit of our armed forces and the ardor of our industrial workers. We need to stir the imagination and aspirations of all people, free or temporarily enslaved, for new objectives, new goals which can be reached when the war is won.

That means, of course, the use of political warfare as a weapon in winning the war. And the American Charter can well be such a weapon, if we are willing to use it. For it is a revolutionary answer to the needs of a revolutionary age. The demands that ordinary people all over the world make upon their statesmen are modest but fundamental demands for a chance to have a job, and to bring up healthy children, and be secure against want and destitution, and to make a life as well as a living.

If we can offer now a charter for a post-war America that meets these demands in our own country, how powerful a weapon we shall be forging in winning the war! It will be a weapon, first, in demoralizing the enemy. The Nazis have told their people that they must sell their birthright of freedom in return for security. They find now that they have lost freedom wihout achieving security. If we can show that we have a plan for the future which achieves security without losing freedom, we shall be taking away much of the reason for their resistance against our armies. It was truly said in World War I that Wilson's Fourteen Points were worth more than that number of divisions in their effects on the German morale, both of troops and civilians. The same could be true of the rather vague Four Freedoms, when supplemented by the very specific program of the American Charter.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It could also be a weapon in heartening our friends in the countries still under Hitler's domination. For two decades during the inter-war period they struggled to achieve a measure of security and an approach to full employment. Their own governments were, on the whole, incapable of giving it to them. It was only the irresponsible demagogues among the fascists who promised it to them, but all that fascism was finally able to deliver was tyranny and war. Here is an instance of a responsible democratic government with a tradition of civil liberties and a record of realistic accomplishment, setting out to achieve the goals of jobs and security for America. How heartening this could be for those who had begun to despair about democracy!

It could, finally, be a weapon for strengthening our own armies, in the battlefields and in the factories. For all their casualness, soldiers do ask themselves the basic questions of what they are fighting for. And in the war industries, the vision of a not impossible American future of jobs and security could be the most radical and satisfactory answer to the problem of labor absenteeism and labor unrest.

III. *Post-War Needs.* – It has become a truism that a nation can win the war but lose the peace. That happened to America and, in fact, to all the Allied countries after World War I. The vast majority of people in the United Nations are determined that it must not happen again. But they are puzzled as to how they can prevent it. There are two phases of the problem. One has to do with foreign policy and diplomacy and power politics and world reconstruction: this is largely in the hands of small elite groups, and—except in the most general terms and over a long-run period of time—it is very little subject to the people's control.

The other phase has to do with our own economic and social system after the war. There we can do something because we can, if we choose, elect an administration pledged to a specific program of action.

Such a program must be geared to post-war needs that are fairly clear to us because we experienced them after World War I. We need a satisfactory plan for demobilizing the men in the armed services and the men in the war factories. We need a plan for demobilizing the machines and factories themselves, and turning a large proportion of them back to civilian uses. We need a plan for demobilizing the war controls, and for building the necessary new peacetime controls. We need finally a long-range plan for social security and for full employment.

We can still remember how *not* to do all this, for that was the method we adopted after World War I. We dumped the returning soldiers and the demobilized war workers back into the labor market, and left them dependent on the anarchic and uncontrolled forces of that market. We gave each soldier, as the report puts it, sixty dollars and a ticket back home—and sent him back to a social jungle where the law that obtained was the law of tooth and fang and claw. We made no effort to use for the people's benefit the factories that the people's money and labor had built and paid for during the war.

Will it be different this time? We cannot answer that. One thing, however, is clear: it *can* be different this time. We have a new vision:

A New Bill of Rights

1. The right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years;

2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift and other socially valuable service;

3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care;

4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment and accident;

5. The right to live in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority and unregulated monopolies;

6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police;

7. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact;

8. The right to education, for work, for citizenship and for personal growth and happiness; and

9. The right to rest, recreation and adventure, the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization.

Whether that vision can be enacted into reality depends on our own will and energy.

IV. *Post-War Politics.* – Whether we like it or not the fate of the American Charter will be largely tied up with American and world politics during the years immediately preceding and following the end of the war. The fact is that this is still strongly a conservative war. If it remains that until the end, there will be little attempt to use the methods of political warfare in the war itself, and little attempt to stir up the impulses of democratic liberation in Europe and the Far East on the basis of a revolutionary post-war world. In this context any considerable emphasis upon the American Charter and upon its English counterpart, the Beveridge plan, might well raise post-war expectations in the minds of many of the peoples of Europe and the Far East which the ruling groups in America and Britain would not be prepared to fulfill and would rather not raise.

There is also the fact to be reckoned with that America has at present one of the most conservative Congresses in its history, and a press whose outlook can vie with that of Congress in this respect. The opposition that the Beveridge plan has met in England gives some clue to the sort of opposition that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Charter is likely to meet here, even if the administration pushes it hard. The insurance companies, the medical associations, the school boards, the banks, the associations for tax economy, the real-estate groups, all will be found lining up against it. The cry will be raised that it is revolutionary, that it is state socialism, that it is bureaucracy, that it menaces individual initiative, that it leads to a totalitarian state.

All this will not be surprising, and will be in the nature of politics. What will make it more intense than usual, and give it an extraordinary meaning that such attacks do not generally have, is the fact that it will be linked with one of the most important election campaigns in American history.

The man who wins the presidency in 1944 and the party that has power through him are the man and party who will contrive not only the American destiny but the world's destiny for some time to come. It is fairly clear that if President Roosevelt wishes to run for another term, and if he gets the Democratic nomination again, the American Charter would be a possible domestic program for him—a banner under which his forces could march, with a United Nations world organization as an international program. It is fairly clear also that an effective way by which he might possibly be prevented from running again, or perhaps beaten if he did run, would be a concerted congressional press and business attack on the American Charter from the very start.

On the other hand, it is not wholly clear as yet that President Roosevelt, even if he intends to run, will champion the American Charter militantly. Thus far the administration has done nothing to push or dramatize it. All that it has done has been to throw it into the congressional hamper. Possibly the President prefers not to push it now, lest he be accused of splitting the home front and interfering with the war. Possibly also, since he is politically shrewd, he would prefer the American people to accustom themselves to the idea, and let the edge of novelty be worn off it, before he comes militantly to its defense. And finally it is possible, since he is a good political pragmatist, that he is waiting to see the direction of the political winds, and gauge the popular reception of the plan, before he commits all his political fortunes for the future to it.

Beyond all these speculations, however—and they can only be speculations at present—there are several propositions about which one can be much clearer.

First, in our system of government anything as far-reaching and thoroughgoing as the American Charter requires a mandate from the people at a presidential election before any administration can go ahead with confidence enacting its major provisions.

Second, while the press and congressional attacks will use the most violent invective and the most sanguinary hyperboles in speaking of the plan, there will be a behind-the-scene jockeying for position by each of the parties in order to get the voting prestige associated with the plan.

Third, unless the American people are wholly duped by the verbiage of the attacks on the plan, their deepest post-war needs and aspirations will lead them to throw their support to whatever party and candidate seems most genuinely to mean such a program.

Fourth, an America that is launched on a post-war internal program of this character will be better able economically, politically and morally to meet the international problems that will face it.

I. The Security Program

What Is Proposed

STATED in its simplest terms, the social-security program of the NRPB proposes to ameliorate some of the worst evils of poverty in the United States. It would fill in the gaps in the present social-security system and rectify the errors that were made because of inexperience and political timidity.

The NRPB recognizes that more important than anything else is a condition of general prosperity in the country, and it favors financial and economic measures to bring this about. It believes, however, that no action likely to be taken in the United States in the visible future will do away with long-range unemployment, which will be particularly acute after the war. It wants the country to recognize—as it has never yet done—that unemployment is not a sudden temporary crisis, to be handled as an emergency matter, but something for which we should plan in advance on a basis of continuing policy. We can afford the program the board proposes if we can continue to maintain a national income of $100,000,000,000 or more per year, which the NRPB believes we can do. The financial measures it outlines should be an integral part of the entire economic and financial system of the government, and can indeed be used by the government either to keep the national economy rolling at an even rate or, if desired, suddenly to accelerate that rate.

For these purposes the board proposes an expanded and better regulated system of unemployment and old-age insurance. It proposes further a great system of care for youth between the present school-leaving age and twenty-one. It proposes health and medical services, including disability insurance when the worker is kept from his job by illness or as the result of accident. It suggests continuing aid to the families of the unem-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployed when necessary, even after the period of unemployment insurance (it suggests twenty-six weeks) has expired. It anticipates the time when the entire nation will be brought up to certain minimum standards even as to education, recreation, health and general culture.

The board is not dogmatic as to the relationship between the federal government and the states. It would use one or the other, or the administrative facilities of counties or municipalities, or any or all of the four, according to what necessity dictated in each case. In general, however, for solid concrete reasons and not because of any moral judgment, it emphasizes the role of the federal government rather than that of the states or smaller subdivisions. This is primarily because economic activity in the United States pays no attention to state borders but flows freely throughout the continental area.

In the case of old-age pensions, for example, the board recommends that these should be wholly administered by the federal government for the reason that so many Americans live and work in more than one state during their lifetimes that state operation becomes unreasonable. Social security should be extended to the major groups in the community which are now without it, including agricultural workers and domestic help. If a special condition of their occupation makes it impossible or difficult to cover them into the existing insurance plans, special schemes should be set up.

A striking aspect of the board's report is its emphasis on the creation of sound work habits in youth before the age of twenty-one. The board proposes, in effect, that every boy and girl shall receive whatever degree of higher education he is intellectually capable of absorbing, without reference to the financial status of his parents. This is in some ways the most revolutionary aspect of the whole plan. Those who are not retained in school between the present school-leaving age and the age of twenty-one, if they are not privately employed, should be given the opportunity to work under government auspices, preferably as apprentices.

The board envisages a large, long-term system of public works, of the maximum possible value to the community, both for its own sake and for its value as a flywheel for the national economic machinery. Workers on these jobs should be paid as nearly as possible the current rate for equivalent work in private industry. The standards of performance demanded of them should be of the highest. Repeatedly the report emphasizes the necessity for highly trained administrators of all phases of its program.

It is also strongly emphasized that support for these plans should on the whole come out of the national treasury (this would not be true of course of insurance plans requiring definite deposits by individuals). The board strongly disapproves of special taxes, such as consumption taxes, earmarked for care of the unemployed, etc. It points out that such taxes usually bear most heavily upon the poor themselves, who can least afford it. The board is also opposed to plans which attempt to take care of the unemployed, or the destitute in general, solely on a basis of "avoiding starvation." If this is done, a public opinion is created which may easily demand an end to relief operations as soon as the actual threat of literal starvation has receded.

The New Plans v. What We Have Now

THE NEW PLANS of the NRPB are of course very much wider than our present social-security system. As pointed out earlier, they embrace numerous subjects not included in the present scheme, such as a public-works program, special provision for youth up to twenty-one, the extension of free public education and medical and health care. In addition, in the actual fields of unemployment insurance and old-age pensions, important changes are envisaged. In general, these are proposed to remedy the faults which experience has proved to exist in our present system. Perhaps the simplest way to indicate the desired changes is to tell what is wrong with these plans at the present time. For the actual criticism which follows, however, the editors of The New Republic are solely responsible.

When our social-security system was set up, for some reason the authorities in Washington disregarded or misinterpreted the experience of all other countries throughout the world, some of which had social-security schemes going back nearly fifty years. They also disregarded the advice of practically every expert in this country. A plan was proposed which did deference to the supposed prejudices of members of Congress, and of the public, including the passion for "states' rights."

The first serious defect is the division of responsibility between the federal government and the states in regard to unemployment insurance. Another is that the coverage is grossly inadequate. Not only are great groups unprotected, such as agricultural workers, domestic servants and the self-employed, but there are huge numbers of other individual cases where people fall through the broad meshes, so to speak. Third, we have no provision for people who become permanently disabled through illness or accident. Fourth, our social-security system contains no provision for health or maternity insurance.

A great weakness of the unemployment-insurance system is the "merit-rating plan," which has spread over the country with great rapidity in the past few years until it now exists in forty states. This scheme provides

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that an employer is permitted a reduction in his payments into the unemployment-insurance fund provided he is exceptionally energetic in maintaining full employment for his workers. At first glance this seems like a sound principle, rewarding the employer reasonably for having the enterprise and forethought to plan his work so as to avoid more than an irreducible minimum of unemployment, whether seasonable or otherwise. In fact, however, this scheme is open to many and strong objections. The aim of unemployment insurance is to spread the risk by drawing upon all industrial wealth to cover unemployment losses wherever they may occur. "Merit rating" destroys this aim at the root by partly exempting the more fortunately situated enterprise from a fair share in this burden—precisely the enterprises which are best able to shoulder it. Instead of unemployment insurance using favorably placed enterprises to help the workers, these enterprises use "merit rating" to obtain advantages over competitors and to increase their profits. And finally, merit rating creates a vested interest in the weakening of the whole structure of benefit and protection.

Other weaknesses of this aspect of social security are the inadequate period of time during which payments are made, and the fact that the insurance benefits make no allowance for the number of dependents the unemployed worker may have. A payment which is adequate for a single man may prove far too little for a married man with four or five children. The length of time during which payments are made varies widely up to—at the rare maximum—twenty weeks. As the NRPB suggests, the duration should be made uniform at twenty-six weeks. Of course, if unemployment continues longer than twenty-six weeks, further aid should be provided from relief funds as long as necessary.

If these changes are made, most of the experts believe that the worker, as well as the employer, should contribute to the unemployment-insurance fund. This would make possible larger weekly benefits.

One bad weakness of our present plan is that a man going into the army forfeits his rights under the old-age and survivors' insurance system if he remains in the armed forces more than a brief period of time. This should obviously be rectified by Congress. Most states have wisely protected the servicemen by freezing their status and rights under the unemployment-insurance system. Such protection should be made universal.

We should repeat that the foregoing criticisms of the present social-security system are made by the editors of The New Republic, and not by the NRPB or its Technical Commission. In general, however, they indicate the direction in which the NRPB proposals move. The board urges that the entire public-assistance structure and programs stand in need of serious reconstruction. The new plan asks more adequate coverage and increasing dependence on definite insurance as opposed to haphazard appropriations for relief. It wants the relations between the federal government and the states cleared up, which in general means moving toward increased federal responsibility. It emphasizes the need for trained personnel, which is indirectly more a criticism of the state than of the federal government. And as indicated, it asks many things that are not included in the present system at all.

Is It "An American Beveridge Plan"?

THE PROPOSALS of the NRPB have been called popularly "an American Beveridge plan"; and this is true in the broad sense that both these schemes deal with the general subject of social security. There are, however, important differences.

The Beveridge plan is a definite proposal for insurance, on an actuarial basis. It tells the British subject exactly how much he will have to pay (if the plan is adopted by Parliament) in every walk of life, and just how much he will get back, under a complicated series of varying conditions. The plan is, indeed, so completely worked out that Parliament could adopt it as it stands without doing any further work on it.

By contrast, the American schemes for social security and for the demobilization of our war economy contain almost no figures at all. They indicate what the authors of the reports, the members of the NRPB and the experts on its Technical Commission consider to be desirable social policies. One might almost say that the American documents constitute the background material which someone like Sir William Beveridge might use as a basis for a comprehensive scheme which does not now exist (unless the NRPB has prepared such a document and has not yet made it public).

The American proposals of course go very far beyond the Beveridge report. A list of the projects found exclusively in the NRPB documents includes federal public-work programs, special care for unemployed youth between the school-leaving age and the age of twenty-one, free public higher education for those especially qualified, mixed government-owned and private corporations for control of certain industries vital to national defense, a ten-point "new bill of rights" and even discussion of such matters as the reorganization of our railroads and the development of pipe-lines.

When we confine ourselves to the subject of social insurance, the only one on which the proposals from both sides of the Atlantic are really comparable, we find an immediate important difference. Under the American plan, payments for unemployment insurance

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and old-age pensions depend strictly on the amounts the individual or the employer, or both, have paid in, which depend in turn upon the size of the salary or wages in each case. In the Beveridge plan this is not true; payments are intended to give only a bare minimum necessary for subsistence, and this minimum is handed out without reference to the size of the payments previously made. These payments are not all uniform; they vary, not according to wages and salaries but according to the amount of risk of unemployment in certain industries, especially hazardous work, and so on.

Another important point is that the Beveridge plan gives coverance for women as housewives and is not confined, as is the American plan, to those working for money. It also provides assistance to self-employed persons. These two groups are excluded from the social-security provisions of the American plan, though they would of course be covered, in case of great necessity, under public assistance. This is true in both countries; in one way or another it is proposed that every case of dire necessity shall be aided. (This is already true, in a general way, in both countries, although such assistance is often miserably inadequate and bound around with red tape.) The Beveridge plan, incidentally, gives special assistance in three sets of circumstances not included in the American scheme: the costs of having children, of bringing them up, and of funerals. There is an ironic resemblance here to the special state subsidies for large families which are found in the totalitarian countries and which the experts believe have, in the case of Germany at least, been responsible for a very sharp rise in the birth rate.

The fact that there are numerous subjects covered in the tentative American outline that are not found in the concrete Beveridge proposals does not necessarily mean that the British are neglecting these other matters. Sir William Beveridge was given an exceedingly definite commission to draw up a social-insurance plan, whereas the NRPB has had only vague and general sailing orders to examine and chart the national economy and suggest improvements in it. It would be a tragedy if any large proportion of the British people were forced to live for any length of time at the low level possible under the proposed Beveridge payments —a fact of which Sir William Beveridge is as well aware as anybody else. The argument in favor of his plan is that it at least puts a floor under everybody, a floor which in a great many cases is now completely lacking. Payments under the American plan would presumably also be small, though no figures are given. The American plan, however, pays a good deal of attention to the size of the national income, and to the desirability of keeping it so large that both social security and public assistance are of minimum importance.

What Will Security Cost?

One of the two principal objections to the security program will be the contention that it will cost untold billions of dollars and that we cannot afford it. How much, in fact, will it cost? The report of the NRPB does not contain even the roughest estimate. The amount of money to be paid out will depend on a number of factors, none of which is yet known. One is the rate of benefit under the several insurance schemes. Another is the number of persons to be covered. These factors might at least be estimated, but the report has chosen to lay down general principles rather than to recommend specific regulations. In this respect the Beveridge report has gone further, and hence can include actuarial calculations. But all such figures—even those in the Beveridge plan—must be based on certain assumptions, which are bound to be open to question.

What, for instance, will be the volume of unemployment? Can we expect a continuance of the present rate of incapacitation through sickness or accident, or an improvement, or the reverse? What will happen to the death rate? And if we are talking, not of the total cost but of the burden on the national budget, the report makes no detailed recommendations as to the proportions of contribution to be made by the assured and the government, respectively. Of course, the total cost of the public-assistance program, as distinguished from the insurance, will be borne from public funds, but there is no accurate means of calculating either what rates of "relief" will be paid or how many will need assistance. Obviously much further work needs to be done before legislation can be drafted. In fiscal terms, as is noted above, what we have so far is not a legislative program in the sense of the Beveridge plan, but recommendations for the correct principles to underlie a legislative program.

Paradoxically enough, however, understanding of these principles will lead to an answer concerning whether we can afford the undertaking, without any precise calculations in terms of dollars and cents.

First let us take a look at the plan for public assistance, which is offered to provide a means of living for all those needing help who are not taken care of by the insurance. This must not be understood as a recommendation for a permanent WPA, providing jobs of the leaf-raking type. An integral part of the whole program is to assure full employment, as much employment as possible in private industry and the rest in public construction projects and other undertakings of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

genuine value suitable for public investment. Clearly, if that part of the program is carried out, and if social insurance has a fairly complete coverage, the need for what we have been accustomed to call "relief" will be reduced to a minimum.

There is always, however, a residue of persons needing assistance, most of them for short periods, but all together making a substantial total even during prosperity. There is nothing new about this need; it long antedated the New Deal, but was never planned for on a national basis. The report estimates that the total is not likely to fall below 3,250,000 households under full employment, this being the figure for June, 1940.

The number of recipients of public aid per month between 1933 and 1940 was never below 4,547,000 households and rose as high as 7,975,000 households. The largest number was carried when the national income was near its lowest levels. If we could afford the cost of relief to nearly 8,000,000 households when the national income was between fifty and sixty billion dollars, can we not afford a somewhat more adequate relief to less than half that number when the national income is two or three times as large—as it would be if full employment were obtained?

Or, to put it in another way, if we could give relief to nearly one-quarter of the population when some twelve to fifteen millions were unemployed, can we not sustain a much smaller fraction when there is no abnormal unemployment?

It will at once be objected that much of the cost of relief was met by borrowing. Of the nearly thirty billion dollars spent in this way during eight years, 47.8 percent was borrowed. The report recommends that we borrow for relief only during depressions, and pay the cost out of tax receipts at other times. During full employment, we shall have approximately half the lowest public-assistance expense which we carried in any of those eight depression years. Even then we met more than half of the expense from taxation. It is clear that we should scarcely feel the same burden with a far larger national income than we had at that time.

But suppose we are not successful in avoiding another depression, suppose we have to pay more for relief in consequence, and suppose we borrow all the money. How could we afford that? The answer is that we could better afford to do it than not to do it. For government spending of borrowed bank money enlarges the national income. In so doing, the government utilizes bank credit which, during a depression, would not otherwise be spent. The recipients of the public aid spend the money for groceries, rent and clothing, and the recipients of these expenditures have larger incomes in consequence, as do those from whom they in turn buy. In other words, under these conditions public aid costs nothing, if the people as a whole are considered.

The only question is whether the government will accumulate so large a debt that it cannot go on borrowing money. The possible limits of the national debt are much larger than most people realize, since when payments of interest or principal are made, somebody in the country receives all the money collected for the purpose from taxpayers, and the national income as a whole need not suffer. But, without going further into this controversial subject, it is clear that the main desideratum is to avoid the depressions, and the bank-borrowing along with them. If the whole advice of the NRPB is followed, we need never have another depression like that of 1932.

Now let us turn to the social insurance. There is no question in anybody's mind about the nation's being able to afford fire insurance. Why then any question about any other insurable risk? Regular payments from a great many people, put aside in reserves, are used to pay for the losses of a minority of those who are insured. What is paid in either is paid out in indemnities, or in expenses of running the system, or, if there is a surplus, in investments. An insurance system carries itself.

The real question is whether the individuals who pay the insurance premiums can afford it. They are, of course, better off for the protection, but their purchasing power is meanwhile diminished by the amount of the premiums. This is the consequence, the report believes, not only of the amounts paid by the employees, but in many cases of those paid by the employers. Employers' contributions ordinarily do not act to diminish profits but rather to increase prices or reduce wages. During a depression, that may become a serious matter to the entire economy. Even during ordinary times, the social-security tax is like a sales tax, which tends to decrease purchases and so limits production and the national income.

It will probably infuriate financial conservatives to be told that there is more question about our being able to afford contributory insurance than to afford relief paid out of the national treasury; nevertheless, it is true. For the former may tend to diminish production and employment—which is the one thing we cannot afford, while the latter tends to increase them.

The board frankly recognizes this danger. Its fears are supported not only by theory but by experience. During the last depression, the incurring of a public deficit to pay relief was accompanied by a steady increase in the national income from 1933 to 1937. Then social-security taxes began, while deficit-financed relief payments fell, so that in 1938 the federal budget was practically in balance. Result—a halt in the growth of the national income; indeed, a drop for 1938 and 1939.

One factor which may diminish this danger in the future is the accumulation of reserves in prosperity, and their expenditure in depression. (When the social-security system began, we were just commencing to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accumulate reserves in a relatively depressed period, without much expenditure from the reserves, because most prospective beneficiaries had not yet qualified.)

In addition the board recommends the safeguard of a substantial contribution to the social-security funds from the public treasury, to be met by progressive taxation. This merely means that we lift part of the burden from those who cannot afford to pay without restricting their purchases of goods and services, and place it on those who can. This would diminish any adverse effect on production and employment.

Finally, the board recommends that the economic effect of the social-security taxes and benefits be taken into consideration in the total fiscal planning of the government, so that any deflationary or inflationary influence can be offset by our policy of taxation and borrowing. For social security can be real only in a society in which the need of indemnifying the unfortunate is reduced to a minimum. One of the most important considerations in judging any assistance and insurance plan is to make sure that it is not inharmonious with that aim. The outstanding virtue of the report is that it pays careful attention to the main objective—full employment.

Education Belongs to the People

AMONG THE FOUNDERS of our nation, the man with the clearest vision of the place that education would have to have in a successful democracy was Thomas Jefferson. He saw that ignorant people could not maintain their freedom. He wanted the educational level of all the common people raised. And he wanted to use the school system as a way of sifting out the talented and honorable from the dull and indifferent, and of building a democratic elite of ability that would continually renew the vitality of the nation.

This was the vision. To an extent America has fulfilled it, but only to an extent. One out of every five men of military age in our country today has not gone as far as the fourth grade in his schooling. There are millions of boys and girls who should be in high school and college, and who do not have the chance. There are families who cannot afford to put decent enough clothes on their young children to send them to school. There are rural districts in which the schools are inaccessible. There are communities so impoverished that they cannot support adequate schools. There are children who cannot afford to buy lunches at school. There are adults who missed schooling and who would profit from adult educational work. And, throughout the nation, the teaching staffs tend to be underpaid and overworked, the patterns of instruction have grown rigid without ceasing to be provincial, and the teaching career does not attract enough talent nor offer the freedom and spaciousness without which teaching ceases to have much meaning.

Here is an area in which it is essential to take a bold, sweeping, overall view of the whole problem, including the economic base of learning, the fiscal base of public support of the schools, the technical and cultural levels of instruction.

Such a view is taken by the NRPB report, in a section for which Dr. Floyd W. Reeves seems to be largely responsible. It sees learning as a continuing process, that starts in the pre-school period and continues through adulthood. It sees learning not only as a matter of vocational and professional preparation, and not only as directed toward civic responsibility, but as a matter of training in the creative use of leisure. To put it rather too simply, one must learn to make a living; one must learn to act collectively with one's fellows in the community; but one must also learn to live with oneself, and get an inner strength and confidence and sense of creativeness.

Given these premises, the recommendations of the report take on meaning. They may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Young children need pre-school care in nursery schools and kindergartens. Given their home backgrounds, at least half the children in the age-group of three to five need these services. This means an expansion of some 400 percent over the present facilities.

2. Attendance in elementary school and high school must be assured to all young people. In 1940 there were still three-quarters of a million children not at elementary school. And there are almost two million pupils of high-school age who should be in high school but are not. The margin lies in rural areas, among Negroes and among low-income groups.

3. Forty percent of our youth of college age should be in colleges, universities and technical schools. That means an expansion over the present enrolment of anywhere from 25 to 600 percent, depending on the type of school and the work offered.

4. School lunches must be provided, and also before and after school care for children from homes of working mothers.

5. That a program be developed for adult education, correspondence schools, public libraries and forums.

6. That those demobilized from the armed services and war factories be given a chance to continue their interrupted education and expand their training.

7. That an organized camp program, including work experience, be provided for children who cannot now afford to go to camp.

8. That school districts be reorganized, a program

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of school construction be undertaken, rural transportation be provided.

9. That the quality of the teaching and administrative staffs be raised.

10. That a fiscal program be undertaken, including the use of federal funds to reduce the inequality of educational opportunity existing at present, by which the states and local areas that need educational facilities most do not provide it because of their poverty and backwardness.

This is, at least, something to start with. It will not provide an educational Utopia, but it offers a bill of educational rights with which teachers and students alike may begin the arduous task of teaching and learning.

But it would be a mistake to concentrate too much on the technical, economic and fiscal features of the above program. The essential fact to keep in mind is that education belongs to the people. It is a community responsibility which must be provided, from nursery school through college, to every child that needs it and can benefit from it, regardless of his economic ability to pay.

For the children are the body of any society. And new ideas, which education can alone provide, are its lifeblood. The tasks of education are broadly two: to continue the best elements in the social heritage; to obtain the benefits of innovation. If education remains a privilege of the well-to-do groups, a society like ours will grow rigid and die.

The Health Program

MUCH OF THE CONTROVERSY concerning security against sickness has centered about schemes for compulsory health insurance, such as exist in Britain and many other countries. Those who advocate these plans point out that a large number of the population cannot afford to pay doctors' and hospital bills. Organized medicine in the United States argues that there are plenty of doctors and hospitals available, that charges are moderated or eliminated entirely for the poor, and that it is desirable to maintain the relationship of individual responsibility between the patient and the physician. To this argument the reply is made that what is sought is not medical charity, but a means by which those in the middle and lower income groups who earn their way can be insured against the crushing burden of extraordinary expenses for illness.

The NRPB report scarcely touches this controversy. It makes no proposal for a health-insurance system; the nearest approach is a recommendation for insurance against disability—which would presumably indemnify the sick or insured person for loss of income, but might co-exist with any conceivable system of medical service.

The reason for the omission may be that the government is not ready with a detailed plan in this hotly controversial field. Whatever the reason, the omission is in one respect fortunate, since it helps to transfer the center of interest to a far more important aspect of the health program. The big job is not so much to make sure that the sick are taken care of, necessary as that is, as to reduce the volume of sickness. Just as it is a defeatist social attitude to provide for compensation for the unemployed without striving to prevent unemployment, so it is defeatist to throw energies into care for the sick rather than to direct them into minimizing the need for that care.

According to an estimate of the United States Public Health Service, 400,000,000 man-days are lost every year from all types of disability. In 1940, the loss in production alone was fifty times the loss from strikes. Similar figures could be piled up showing the economic cost of ill health—for example, the enormous toll of hospitalization, or the poor physical and mental condition of a large proportion of men examined for the army. If one goes on to count the social and political cost, which ramifies into every phase of human life—including war, crime and depression—the burden is literally incalculable.

It is the assumption of medical science that all illness, with the probable exception of old age and death, is theoretically preventable. Research workers are still engaged in the task of pushing back the frontiers of knowledge which makes prevention possible, and the territory conquered is already wide. Yet application of this knowledge lags far behind the discoveries of the scientists. We should think it a national scandal if the automobile or electrical industries were one-tenth as tardy in introducing the latest gadget as the nation is in adopting proved measures necessary to reduce deaths in childbirth or infectious diseases or malnutrition.

The first recommendation of the report is the obvious one of providing adequate public-health services. In June, 1942, there were more than 1,200 counties in the nation without the services of a full-time local or district health department. It is the health department which oversees sanitation, the isolation of contagious diseases and much of the other ordinary work of preventive medicine.

A good illustration of our antiquated attitude in this sector of life is that in 1940 the nation spent nearly $30 per capita of the population for the care of sickness, but only $1.35 per capita for the preventive work of health services.

Necessary improvements in sanitation alone will require $2,500,000,000 for construction work in the next

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decade. We are far behind an adequate program, in many parts of the country, for preventing communicable diseases, or for taking ordinary precautions in maternity and childhood. Expansion of the health program for mothers and children is an important recommendation of the report. Another is better protection of factory and farm workers against occupational hazards.

The second item in the proposed health program deals with adequate nutrition. In spite of the enormous amount recently printed on this subject, few understand the prevalence, in this richest of all countries, of malnutrition, and fewer still its far-reaching results, especially if suffered in infancy and childhood. Nutrition is partly a problem of vitamins, minerals, fats and proteins—that is, of knowledge concerning what we ought to eat. It is partly a problem of having incomes sufficient to buy what we ought to eat. Even for those with sufficient knowledge and income, however, it is partly a problem of obtaining the required food values in the stuff that is turned out by the factory system and dished out in restaurants. It is probable that the poor farmer or peasant of centuries ago was in many cases better fed than the city-dweller of today, because he ate his own grain and vegetables without first removing half the nutriment from them. Finally—and this is a little recognized truth which the report does not mention—nutrition is an important emotional problem, since overeating and undereating, as well as irrational tastes and distastes for food which obstruct the natural tendency to crave what we need, are in nine cases out of ten traceable to personality disturbances acquired in childhood.

It will take public expenditure to spread the knowledge of what we ought to eat, in a form such that the ordinary citizen can choose a meal without the use of logarithmic tables. Provision of enough income to buy adequate food is a function of the whole security program. Incidentally, we are now experiencing a striking proof of the fact that for years many people have not had such an income. During depression, we thought we were growing a food surplus. Production of food in 1942 was 25 percent above the depression average. Lend-lease is taking but a small share of it. But we are short of almost everything except bread, for the simple reason that millions of men in the army and navy are being fed, for the first time in their lives, as much of the good foods as the nutrition experts think they ought to have, while millions of industrial wage-workers can afford, for the first time in years, to buy good food in the markets.

Knowledge and public regulation both will be necessary to improve the qualities of food available to the purchaser. (We have already made one great advance in that respect through the fortifying of bread.) Progress in dealing with the emotional difficulties, in this as in other fields, waits on the widespread application of psychiatry and mental hygiene.

In its section on adequate medical care for all, the report emphasizes the provision of facilities rather than any new system of regulating or paying for them. However well provided certain areas are with hospitals and physicians, facilities for care of the sick are very unevenly distributed about the country. In 1940 the United States Public Health Service estimated that in rural areas at least 240 new hospitals are needed, with 15,500 beds. It is a well known fact that even in peacetime medical personnel is both scarce and of inferior quality in many more sparsely settled or poorer districts of the country. This condition cannot be expected to correct itself under medical individualism, since doctors tend to congregate where the good hospitals and the paying patients are.

What the NRPB Report has to offer on health is true and elementary, but it falls far short of a medical plan for the nation. The fact that we do not have such a plan is mainly the fault of the spirit that governs the American Medical Association. How far behind meeting its professional responsibility it falls may be learned from recent reports of the British Medical Association and the discussions in British medical journals.

In Britain, compulsory health insurance has been accepted for years, and nobody would think of abolishing it. But it is far from solving the problem; indeed, as practised in Britain it has serious faults. Those in this country who are devoting their main efforts to arguing for it are just as far behind the times as those who argue against it.

Why must we start where Britain started some decades ago? Why can we not at least begin where Britain is? British authorities are now concerned, not merely with making access to medical care universal, but with vast improvements in preventive medicine, in the proper geographical distribution of medical facilities, in improving the quality of services offered by the general practitioner, both through continuous education and the organization of health centers. They are concerned with stimulating research and opening pathways between new knowledge and practice. They are concerned with the planning of the medical services as a single system, which will coördinate hospitals, public and private, public-health services, research and the individual medical man, around the effort *to reduce the volume of sickness.*

Such planning cannot be done by government economists or social workers. It is not a matter for actuaries and insurance systems. It is the function of experienced and creative medical men. As long as organized medicine in the United States continues to shirk its public duty while fighting a defensive battle against what it regards as lay encroachment upon its province, so long will both doctors and their potential patients suffer, and so long will the nation pay a gigantic bill for preventable illness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is It a Featherbed?

Aside from forebodings about its cost, the chief argument that is made against a comprehensive system for social security is that it is a "featherbed," bolstering citizens from cradle to grave regardless of any effort on their part. This, it is feared, will soften the people by leading them to look to a paternalistic state for help in every emergency, thus robbing them of initiative, thrift and character. The term "social-service state" carries an implication insulting to upstanding individuals who want to earn their own way, free from prying by bureaucratic social workers and without dependency on anyone. Politically, it bears a taint of "*panem et circenses*," which would threaten the destruction of a responsible democracy through the power of demagogues upon whom a rabble would be dependent.

It is easy to caricature this kind of objection; indeed, many of those who express it provide the best caricatures. To lose a job through a calamitous depression for which the individual worker bears no responsibility, and then to draw compensation which is only a fraction of one's former wages, is no rest on a featherbed. Not featherbeds, but hospital cots are provided for those who are unfortunate enough to contract tuberculosis. The retirement pension, financed in part at least by one's own contributions for years, constitutes one of the most respectable institutions of any individualistic economic system; even so, most active men regard it as something of a tragedy to have to retire, especially on half-pay. There is no stigma or loss of initiative involved in accepting education at public expense at least through high school; why should an extension of the system worry anybody? The very men who attack social security as a "featherbed" usually do their utmost to provide for the futures of their own widows and children.

Nevertheless, it will not do to cast aside too easily this kind of objection. Though often ineptly expressed, it contains a core of meaning which we may disregard only at our peril. It is an unfortunate fact that many persons in modern society never grow up into fully responsible adults, social security or no social security. These persons are all too ready to accept the protection of father-images or mother-images, and the state is one of the greatest of these. It is easy to injure both them and society by encouraging their tendency to accept permanent dependency and to render blind emotional loyalty to anyone who appears to be their champion and protector.

During the depression we used to hear much of the "unemployables." These consisted not only of the sick, the crippled or the mentally defective, but of many who had been the recipients of public assistance for so long that they had lost all ambition or capacity for work. Even some of those on WPA projects were harmed as productive individuals because of their consciousness that the jobs they held were being provided in order to keep them alive rather than because of any intrinsic value in the product.

Psychiatrists can testify that just as there are many patients who die because they do not wish to live, so there are many who become sick or remain so because that is a means of avoiding responsibility and of being cared for. This is a danger particularly prevalent in cases where the medical expenses are paid out of compensation funds; doctors even have a slang word for it—"compensitis." Many practitioners regard the phenomenon as deliberate malingering, but it is usually more deeply seated than that.

The NRPB report recognizes this kind of danger in its discussion of the WPA. It examines with some care the charge that WPA employment prevented workers from accepting other suitable jobs which were open. There is need for great ingenuity and discrimination in administering a public-assistance or social-security system. Yet the ordinary conclusion that the recipient must be made to prove his dire need before he receives aid of any kind is exactly and completely wrong. The "needs test" does more to kill initiative than any other principle of administration, for it not only invades privacy and destroys self-respect, but prevents insecure people from earning what they can, inadequate though the pay may be, lest they be removed from the public rolls.

The real answer to the objection, however, is not concerned with such minutiae. It admits frankly that public assistance, and even the payment of insurance benefits, are an unfortunate necessity indeed, if the need for them becomes too widespread and too frequent. The danger in these measures can be minimized only if occasion for resort to them is the exception rather than the rule, and the exceptional nature of the emergency is clearly recognized by all concerned, including the beneficiary. The case of fire insurance may provide an illuminating parallel. Under normal conditions a few people may be induced to be careless about fire because they are insured, but such instances are rare and carry a risk of discovery. But if we can imagine such mismanagement of fire protection that the houses of one-quarter of the citizens burned down in a single year, and as a consequence the receipt of fire insurance became a common and regular means of support, a most unhealthy condition would be created.

The report has the virtue that it stresses, not relief, but avoidance of need for relief. The social-security proposals themselves embody excellent discussions of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the economic policies necessary to minimize unemployment, and some discussion of the health policies necessary to prevent illness. And they are accompanied by a separate report devoted to the avoidance of unemployment and the creation of an expanding economy after the war.

This second report will be discussed in more detail in the next section. Here it is germane to raise the question whether the psychological objections applied to relief also are pertinent to governmental planning designed to avoid unemployment. Usually the two kinds of project are lumped together by their opponents as activities of a paternalistic state. Individual self-reliance is equated with the activity of business enterprise, and it is assumed that anything which does not flow from private business is accomplished, not by the citizens, but by the state for the citizens.

This is a complete and vulgar distortion of the issue. Self-reliant individuals who have a shred of political intelligence will want both industry and governmental affairs so planned and administered that jobs will be plentiful and production high. To rely on good planning by those who have executive power, and to insist on removal of those in power if they do not plan well, is a sign not of weak dependence but of sturdy democracy. In the same way, we demand skilled and responsible engineers to design our bridges, skilled surgeons to perform our operations. In the complex web of modern society it is individualism run to seed to insist that every man be able to do everything for himself and that nothing be delegated to experts. It is not the job of the individual worker or the individual business man, no matter how intelligent and self-reliant he may be, to plan the balanced interrelations of a total national economy. He will be doing enough if he performs his own work well, and at the same time demands results from those to whom he delegates tasks that are beyond his individual competence.

Indeed, there is a good deal of evidence to indicate that the very proneness of people in modern society to accept dependency arises largely from the fact that too much is expected from them rather than too little. They live in a confused, interdependent and baffling world which the individual cannot manage, with any amount of cleverness and effort. They are not in the position of the pioneer whose welfare depended mainly on his own capacity. Yet they are supposed to behave according to maxims derived from a pioneer society. When they fail, as social and economic derangements often force them to do, they are likely to surrender completely before the impossible task which has been set. Thus they tend to regress to the childish dependence on all-powerful states and social messiahs.

People cannot live and thrive without a certain kind and amount of security. They should not, of course, be allowed to be confident that no matter how little effort they make, they will always be taken care of. But on the other hand, they have to feel secure in the faith that the legitimate satisfactions of life are not wholly beyond their powers, if they can muster enough wisdom and energy. In order to enjoy that kind of security, they must live in a social environment which does not systematically betray expectations which it arouses. Successful planning against the occurrence of mass unemployment would be one of the greatest possible safeguards against the disappearance of a self-reliant democratic society. In such a social environment, social security would be not a featherbed but a fire-net.

II. The Job Program

Getting from War to Peace

THE NRPB recognizes that the problem of demobilizing our war economy, when the struggle is over, is one of great difficulty. It urges that the nation should go to work immediately on plans many of which cannot be carried out at all unless they are fully matured before "D-Day"—the day for demobilization—arrives. It notes that the war might end in one part of the world while continuing in another; if the present grand strategy of the United Nations is carried out, it will probably end in Europe before it does in Asia. This might (though not necessarily) mean that part of our army would come home, part of our war factories stop producing, even while some of the fighting still continued.

The general aim of the board is to make the change from war to peace with a minimum of hardship; and to do this, the aid of the government is invoked to the full. It is nonsense, however, to say that the board's proposals are "socialistic," as some hostile critics have done. These men obviously have not read the report, which spends much time and attention in explaining that it relies mainly upon private capitalist enterprise, operated for profit, and invokes government aid only when this seems absolutely necessary.

Soldiers should be let out of the army at least as carefully as they are taken into it. The national policy, already stated by President Roosevelt, is that every returning soldier should get back his old job or one as good. In the case of students who had not completed their education, full provision must be made for returning them to school. A national reëmployment committee in Washington should be supplemented by local committees all over the country. The board, which suggests a dismissal allowance for workers in war plants,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

believes that perhaps a dismissal allowance for soldiers would also be a good idea.

What is to be done with the vast accumulation of war factories all over the country? The board says flatly that as an alternative to economic chaos and acute distress, it might be well to keep these factories going for some time even if the war goods they turn out are not needed. A certain proportion of the plants will be required in any case for the needs of the standing army that we shall presumably require. Some others must be kept going on an experimental basis, testing new weapons. Others will shift over to peace goods, and the government must help with this transition. Still others will need to be closed down entirely. In deciding which plants should go, the authorities will seek to create a double pattern: they will try to decentralize industry and prevent it from concentrating in a few localities; and they will also try to create a pattern that is safe from the standpoint of national defense. No dictator in his senses would ever have followed the American plan of concentrating a great part of war industry in New England and Southern California, both areas susceptible of successful invasion by an enemy. In selling off government-owned plants, care must be taken not to build up monopolies; ownership should be kept scattered.

During the transition period, certain government controls must be maintained. The longer the war continues, the greater the extent of necessary government interference with private business and the longer the corresponding period when post-war controls must be kept. To prevent a runaway inflation when consumers compete for new goods coming on to the market in limited quantities, such goods must be rationed for a time, the durable items probably longer than the non-durable ones. Raw materials will need to be allocated for a considerable interval, and prices and wages must be controlled for a certain period. In many cases, of course, production of peacetime goods can start immediately and full-scale. This will be especially desirable, since from the American stockpile must come food and supplies not only for ourselves but for devastated Europe.

Among the raw materials which must be allocated under government control are those needed for the building industry. A great housing program will be required and the ravages of war in other areas of the national economy must be repaired—notably in the field of transportation. It would be a grave mistake to permit these materials to be drained off for less essential purposes, merely because purchasers had the financial resources to pay higher prices in the open market.

For Permanent Prosperity

An aspect of the NRPB report that is of great importance is the one devoted to the future of America after the war is ended and the post-war demobilization has been successfully accomplished. The board envisions a country more prosperous and contented than any nation has ever been. It does so, however, not by mere utopian day-dreaming but by sober and detailed plans for remedying past defects.

These plans embrace, of course, the whole subject of this supplement. Insurance against unemployment, disability and old-age, plus generous public assistance in all other cases of great necessity, would cushion the shock of destitution, although on such a modest scale that, as pointed out before, it should not sap the self-reliance of the individual. The state would assume its proper responsibility for adequate health standards, for vocational training for all and for as much education to every individual as he is fitted to absorb. A permanent policy of large-scale public works would help take up the slack of the economic cycle. Comparatively heavy taxation emphasizing individual incomes and inheritances, and relying less heavily on corporate and consumption taxes, would prevent the accumulation of unused funds in the economic system. All this should be coupled with effective measures against monopoly.

In certain cases the board recommends that mixed corporations should be set up, partly governmental and partly private. This part of the plan has been attacked as being socialistic by editorial writers and congressmen neither of whom, it is obvious, has read the details. Is is nothing of the sort. There are many cases where a situation clearly calls for mixed operation of this sort as being better than purely private or purely governmental enterprise. The Port of New York Authority, which among other things, sells bonds, builds bridges and tunnels, collects tolls and retires the bonds, is an example of such activity. There are numerous other illustrations of the same thing in the current operations of our federal, state and municipal governments, and these enterprises are a commonplace in most other civilized countries today.

One field where partial government ownership or control or both is desirable is that of industries involving strategic materials which are vital to the national defense. For example, if the rubber industry were left entirely to its own devices after the war, it might easily return to dependence on rubber from Malaysia and the East Indies, a course which would be very short-sighted from the point of view of our national interest. This is not because the leaders of this industry are unpatriotic but because under the inexorable laws of competition, they must buy their raw materials in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cheapest market or face ultimate bankruptcy. The same principle holds in regard to many other scarce materials, including particularly essential metals that are not found within the borders of the United States. We have recently had a vivid illustration of the importance of these because of the fact that Mr. Jesse Jones, charged with the responsibility for creating stockpiles of these things before the war began, failed to do so.

The national safety also requires close federal control of transportation in all its branches to make sure that the strains of a possible war emergency can be met. We are paying dearly at this moment for our failure to do this before the beginning of the present war.

Sharp federal supervision is also necessary for industries based upon supplies that are plentiful now but limited in extent. Oil and lumber are two illustrations of this.

An example of desirable mixed public and private enterprise is the field of housing, in which the government's power of condemnation can be used to assemble the large sites which alone are economical under modern conditions. The plan envisages a tremendous amount of new housing to fill the huge deficit which existed when we entered the war and has rapidly grown larger.

Another field for mixed public and private corporations is the production and distribution of electric power. The Tennessee Valley Authority is of course the model here. The report envisions a whole series of such developments throughout the country, which would include hydro-electric power, flood and erosion control, irrigation and other kinds of regional development.

Transportation is another field to which, the report says, great attention should be given after the war. It is recommended that the railroads of the country should be divided into a small number of regional systems, and needless duplication of services be ended, particularly in regard to terminal facilities. Highways should also be improved and extended and bus and truck transportation should be similarly coördinated, with union stations and combined freight depots wherever possible. The improvement of inland waterways is also included in the plan. A pipe-line system for carrying oil and other suitable products would be worked out on a broad national scale. To supplement all this, there should be a comprehensive plan for the care of our land as a whole, for irrigation, the maintenance of wild life and recreation areas.

The future of the airplane is considered, especially in the light of the new worldwide routes which fly a great-circle course even though it may pass over desolate Arctic wastes. Government aid is recommended for the support of the industry and especially for creating adequate airports wherever they are needed.

Perhaps taking a leaf from the plans created in various countries in the recent past which cover a definite period of the future, the report recommends a six-year plan for all the government agencies that would work together on these ambitious schemes.

If all, or nearly all, of these plans are put into operation with imagination and courage, it is the judgment of the authors of the NRPB report that the United States can attain a reasonably high degree of prosperity and a permanently expanding economy. The report strongly emphasizes the fact that financial figures should never be allowed to prevent the nation from doing something that is desirable, provided only that it has the men and the materials. It is nonsense for any nation to say to itself that it "cannot afford" this or that. Such an attitude argues from the false analogy of the individual—and even as to the individual, the statement is often wrong. If the nation as a whole wants a substantially higher standard of living and is willing to work intelligently to that end, such a standard of living can be attained.

The editors have sought to make this special supplement a careful and conservative report on the contents of the plans of the NRPB. If that were not the case, it would be easy to fall into lyricism in describing the picture of the future America that the post-war projects would create.

Most people know by now something of what the TVA has meant to the inhabitants of that region; the members of the NRPB have the vision and courage to demand that there should be a similar enterprise wherever in America the geographical conditions make it possible. They see a future country in which the ravages of more than a century of waste and spoliation have been repaired; where the farmer no longer needs to watch the progressive deterioration of his soil but will be established on a property that can be used by his sons and and his sons' sons for many generations if they so desire. This vision shows us cities in which slums, mean streets and the blighted and warped lives that are produced thereby, have been swept away; we see instead cities broad and uncrowded, sunlit and peaceful, cities in which our accomplishment at last catches up with the vision of our ablest men. The NRPB members see our colleges no longer even partially the playground of the adolescent rich, but centers of the country's best intelligence, its finest youth, in intellectual ferment. They see a nation sufficiently strong and active so that its first charge upon itself is a rising generation every member of which has had opportunities consistent with his native abilities and has been specifically trained for some useful task, of benefit to himself and his fellow men.

All this, to be sure, is at present a utopian image. It will take a long time, much hard work and a lot of money, to bring it into reality. The answer is that we need more utopianism of just this kind, more people with the courage and spirit to plan ahead. For let it be noted that this utopianism is solidly grounded in existing fact. There is nothing here proposed that is not amply within our reach, if we really want it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Theory of Economic Expansion

If this country is to make sure that there is a job open for every returning soldier, how is that result to be obtained? The task of course will not be done if it merely results in throwing out of work those who already have jobs and wish to retain them, for a large volume of unemployment will be sure to affect the fortunes of soldiers along with everyone else. And the task will not stay done if we have a brief post-war boom, followed in a few months or years by another depression. What we really want is permanent full employment. And that will mean a lot more jobs and a much larger volume of production than the nation has ever enjoyed before.

The NRPB, like many others in the country, is concerned about this problem most of all, since it is basic to all issues of security. Some of the board's concrete suggestions are detailed above. But many persons are still puzzled as to the reason for suggestions of this kind. Why must we be prepared to turn to vast projects of construction and other kinds of work financed by the government? Why can we not simply unleash private enterprise and depend on business to produce permanent prosperity—with, perhaps, temporary but endurable interruptions to the kind of growth this nation has always enjoyed until recently?

The motive behind the suggestions is not a socialistic desire to kill or supplant private enterprise—quite the reverse; it aims to help private enterprise prosper and grow, with sufficient satisfaction of the needs of the citizens so that it can endure. And the logic which prompts suggestions of this kind is not just a prejudice or a hunch of economic wild men; it is a closely and carefully reasoned theory to account for the root cause of the economic misfortunes of the past decade—a theory which, though far from universal acceptance by the experts, dominates the thinking of leading economists today.

Those who distrust theories may be convinced by experience which is so generally accepted that it has become a tradition. Long periods of prosperity in the United States have always come when the total economy was expanding. Depressions have come when the economy was stagnating or contracting. New construction, new and growing industries, are the harbinger of growing employment. And new construction and industries are the consequence of the investment of large amounts of capital. It was so in the railroad-building period after the Civil War. It was so, later, during the construction boom and the growth of the automobile industry during the 1920's. Anyone who can understand statistics can go through economic history and correlate the periods of growth and prosperity with the periods of heavy investment of new capital. That investment is the key to employment is a truth that now would be accepted by almost anyone who had paid any attention to the subject, be he conservative, radical or somewhere between.

Pragmatically speaking, the position of the Keynesian economists is merely that when private enterprise shows signs of failing to invest the necessary amounts of capital, the government should step in to fill the deficiency. It need not build pyramids or hire people to dig and fill holes in order to do so. There are plenty of useful and valuable projects waiting for it. Those who believe that such intervention will not be necessary ought to be satisfied with the assurance that the plan does not recommend large governmental investments unless their expectation is proved by events to be unjustified. Why should they object to preparedness against depression, any more than to preparedness against war?

Those who want to know the theory which the economists apply to the generally admitted experience can study it at length, if they wish, in the writings of John Maynard Keynes, Joan Robinson, Alvin H. Hansen and others. In detail, it is a complicated and technical theory. But we may, with some oversimplifications, state its bare essentials.

In a capitalist system, money is always being saved; saving is a social institution. But when anyone saves money, he refrains from spending it. That decreases the total of spending; it is an interruption in the flow of money from hand to hand. Thus, taken by itself, saving tends to decrease production and employment. The factor in our economic order which compensates for the deflationary effect of saving is new investment. Investment in this sense does not mean merely the purchase of stocks or bonds, it means the actual spending of capital by business for new construction or equipment. When new investment grows as fast as money is being saved, all is well. But when the rate of investment ceases to grow, or actually falls off, employment and income at once begin to suffer. Saving itself then falls also because of the smaller incomes received. But it usually does not fall through any tendency to spend more. For the more important savers will ordinarily cut their spending before they reduce the amounts they put aside.

Economists used to believe that all money saved would be automatically invested; if for a time it was not, there would be a surplus of supply over demand in the capital market, the interest rate would fall, and so more investment would be induced by the lower price of money. But such automatic mechanisms are now distrusted by the keener minds. It is believed rather that the investment of money by business men

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depends not so much on the supply available for investment as on some evidence of demand for the product that the new investment would produce.

Here is where a great change has taken place in our economy. During the pioneer days of a new country and a rapidly growing population, it used to be taken for granted as a rule that there would be a demand for anything of value that could be produced. But that is true no longer. Careful advance calculations are made of possible sales. New investment is "administered" by large corporate interests which are fearful of overproduction and glutted markets. Other influences as well combine to restrict the use of new savings. On account of rapid advances in the techniques of production, it is often possible to expand output many fold with only an inconsiderable expenditure for new equipment. And, as the general level of income rises, savings grow faster than spending, because those with higher incomes save a larger proportion of what they make.

On these and other accounts, the economists believe that a deficiency of new investment is normally to be expected. They believe that this factor is what accounts for the long continued depression of the past decade, which they think was more than an ordinary cyclical recession of business. They expect another deficiency of new investment some time after the war. This is not because they think no new investment will take place. But they are conscious that a truly enormous amount must be invested if full employment is to be achieved and made continuous. They cannot conceive of enough new industries, and know of no plans of business, which would spend the requisite amount.

By saying that an economy has become "mature" and therefore tends to stagnate, this school of economists does not mean that all demands of consumers are satisfied and there is no more room for a growth of useful production. Far from it. They believe there is a scope for growth of business enterprise far beyond anything known before. But they believe also that the present institutions and habits of business are such that it cannot realize the possibilities without the help of something much bigger. The national income which must be achieved to attain full employment, under the high productivity of modern technique, is so huge, and the savings which will normally be withdrawn from it are so tremendous, that they think nothing short of great public enterprises financed by government, which is the biggest business of all, will suffice to hold new investment at the level required to keep business active and assure employment for all needing to work. If this belief is proved mistaken by an unexpected growth of private investment, no harm will have been done by advance preparation for public investment. But if it is proved true, we shall sorely need the advance planning which is now urged upon us.

The "Partnership" Principle

To PLAN for an expanding economy is one thing; to plan for a controlled economy is another. Although the two phases of the problem are related, they need to be considered separately.

The term "control," like the term "bureaucracy," has been invested by Congress and the press with sinister and unpopular meanings. It is one of the broadest and vaguest terms in the vocabulary of political science, yet it cannot easily be dispensed with. Obviously "government control" means more than "government regulation." Obviously also it means less than "government operation" or "government ownership." Regulation means the most general sort of oversight which contents itself with setting the rules of the game that have to be observed, with the government assuming the role of umpire. Operation and ownership by the government are recognized and traditional forms of socialism. In between, government control implies that the government, without going as far as operation or ownership, recognizes the basic public stake in particular industries or phases of the economy and takes a hand in making certain crucial and strategic decisions.

What are the alternatives to government control? It had better be recognized at the very start that the old ideal of laissez-faire is no longer possible. There are even some who maintain that it never existed—that it was the light that never shone on sea or land. Be that as it may, it is no longer a practicable part of the future. Some sort of planning and control already exists in every great economic system in the world. Some sort of planning and control there will have to be, to an increasing degree. The real questions are: What sort? By whom? For what purposes? With how much public benefit? Allowing for how much liberty?

Broadly speaking, there are three forms of control possible, each of them, of course, including variants of its own. One is control and planning by business itself, without much intervention by the government. In Herbert Hoover's day this was known as "industrial self-government," and under New Deal I it took the form of the NRA. Its features are the cartel system, the growth of huge monopolies, the division of the market and the world between them, the squeezing out of the small competitors. It means in effect the creation of a state within a state—an economic state which ultimately bursts its bounds and absorbs the political state, a corporate economy which cannot stop until it becomes the corporate state. This is the dream of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"peak associations" like the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce. It has been put in polite and persuasive form currently by the speeches of Eric A. Johnston, president of the latter organization.

The second form is control and planning by government, with little or no intervention by business enterprise. In its fullest form this will be found in the Soviet Union; partial forms of it are found in Germany and Japan. In essence this is statism—the dominance of the state in economic life, and its assumption of all the basic functions once performed by private ownership and profit. It may be, and tends to be, although not necessarily, totalitarian in its political organization. If it is directed toward raising levels of popular welfare, as in Russia, it may also be socialist.

The third broad form is some sort of coöperation between business enterprise and government. This is the road that America has thus far sought to travel during the entire history of the New Deal. The American Charter would merely broaden and extend that road into the post-war future.

The NRPB calls the sort of coöperation it envisages a "partnership" between business and government. To some extent, of course, "partnership" is a good term for semantic reasons. It does not carry the sinister implications of control. Nevertheless, in any problem affecting the running of an economy, there must be the question of ultimate responsibility and ultimate power. As Thomas Hobbes put it a long time ago, "When two ride one horse, one must ride in front." And it must be clearly understood that the determination of what areas shall be assigned to this partnership, and the final decision in questions of dispute, must rest with the people acting through their government.

This does not mean that private enterprise is to be discarded or ignored. The whole tone of the NRPB report is what is generally called "affirmative" with respect to private enterprise. Its assumptions are that where private enterprise has thus far failed, it is because it sought to do by itself an impossible job; because it does not have within itself the capacity for clearing away obstructions that get into its path; because the channels of investment have become clogged and stagnant; because small business has been pushed to the wall by monopolies and their concentrated power; because purchasing power has been dried up through the incapacity of private enterprise to plan and spend and control its own broad savings policies in the public interest.

What the report envisages therefore is a government-industry partnership which will make possible once more the "healthy" and "aggressive" operation of private enterprise. The second term contains some dubious implications: but presumably the aggression will be directed not at small and powerless competitors, nor at labor or the consumer, but at the conquest of productive problems and the solution of the problem of full employment.

The specific program that the report recommends in this area is a fourfold one.

The first element of it is a program of industrial research under government auspices and financing. This means, of course, further technological expansion. Since much of the available technological capacity of industry has not been fully used—except in our war economy—the skeptical reader may well ask why we are thinking of further technological research. In a contracting or stagnant economy, this would be nonsense. But if a dynamic and expanding economy can be achieved, this begins to make a lot of sense. For ultimately all economic advance depends upon research and invention, and the proper use of them. To have this research conducted under government auspices makes a good deal of sense. And incidentally it eases for the future the problems of patent control. For patents that are discovered with the people's money are obviously patents that belong in the public domain.

This question of patent control forms the second broad element of the program. Here the report proceeds rather gingerly over what is obviously, in the minds of most corporate business men, dangerous ground. It pleads for administrative reform of the existing patent structure, which is not a very radical idea. It goes on to urge the distinction between "primary," or "basic," and "secondary," or "improvement," patents, with a greater degree of control over the second pair. It goes on to consider the problem of patent "pools," and dallies with the idea of governmental acquisition of "suppressed" patents which particular corporations have kept from development. And it ends with the question whether the government might not forbid outright the assignment of patent rights by one corporation to another.

A bolder confronting of the whole patent problem would seem desirable. Patent rights are at best a toll imposed on the public. That toll is in many instances justified by the need for stimulating invention and originality and the commercial development of an idea. But the burden of proof should always be on the side of those who argue that a particular technological innovation should be kept out of the public domain. And there can be little doubt that the lack of adequate patent control has been one of the factors in the creation of monopoly power.

It is this problem of monopoly power that forms the third broad element in the problem of private enterprise and government control. Here the report calls for a "more discriminating" application and enforcement of the anti-trust laws. It pays particular attention to the fact that at the end of the war the monopoly problem will be far more serious than it was at the beginning. For the war has meant the encouragement of the big corporations, to whom most of the government

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war contracts have been awarded. Thus, as of July 1942, 70 percent of our war contracts have gone to 100 corporations, while 9 percent have gone to a single corporation. This means not only the squeezing out of the small business man. It means also the creation of concentrated corporate power which can dwarf political power, corrupt the entire electoral process, dominate the press, make its way into the educational system and master the whole of the society. As to just how this problem of concentrated corporate power will be met the report is not wholly clear. But met it must be.

The most specific suggestion in this connection, and the fourth broad element in the program of control, is the entrance of the government directly into certain crucial areas of our economy, through the device of the "mixed corporation" to which we have already referred above. These mixed corporations would be the administrative expression of the partnership principle. They would operate, as we have said, in those industries crucial to war in which the government already has a large investment, and in certain other industries in which expansion is necessary, and finally in the industries formerly under the control of aliens or in which patents are crucial.

If interpreted boldly this would mean the direct intervention of the government in the making of the basic decisions in some of our most important industries —aluminum, magnesium, chemicals, shipbuilding, aviation, electric power, communications, etc. Such intervention, wisely organized and administered, could go a long way not only to solving the negative problem of monopoly control, but also the more affirmative problem of a democratic economy.

In overall terms what this means is a pluralist approach to the problem of full employment. It rejects the idea that there is some "one way" which will be a panacea for our economic ills. The day of the dogmatic capitalist, the dogmatic socialist, the dogmatic communist, the dogmatic single-taxer, the dogmatic anti-trust enforcer and even the dogmatic planner is over. The American Charter is mainly concerned with the heritage of experience from the past, with the techniques of economic expansion and control that have worked best under the New Deal and the war economy and which can therefore be most fruitfully extended in the post-war period.

This does not and should not mean an unthinking eclecticism, a thing of shreds and patches. All these techniques are unified by the central theoretical conception of an expanding economy, by the engineering and planning conception of the allocation and full use of national resources, and by the moral conception that plenty is better than scarcity and that greater equality of distribution is better than privilege.

There is also behind them the idea that the function of the government is to equalize the disparities of power within the economy, and protect the people against the economic elite.

Administrators and Bureaucrats

THERE ARE TWO practical questions about any planning program. One is, "What will you use for money?" The other is, "How will you run it and whom will you get to run it?" The first question has already been considered in these pages. The second is no less important and difficult.

There are four broad problems affecting administration. One is the sort of agencies you use, the second is the sort of men, the third is the sort of procedures and coördinations, the fourth is the sort of controls.

Thus far, with respect to all four of these problems, the American federal government has suffered from its heritage of piecemeal and unplanned development. New agencies, procedures, controls have sprung up *ad hoc* as the felt need for them grew so urgent that it overcame inertia and the obstacle of vested interests. The result was conflict and overlapping of jurisdictions; bewilderment on the part of state and local authorities and the people themselves who had to deal with the federal agencies; duplication of function; jealousies and rivalries among the agencies.

To say this is not to minimize the creative contribution of American federal administration. By and large it has been a success rather than a failure. America has in the past decade gone through an administrative revolution which has been fertile in new types of agencies, procedure, control, and has been notable for the emergence of a new sort of public servant—a cross among an administrator, an economist, an engineer, a lawyer and a publicist.

But we have had to pay a price for waiting so long before developing new agencies, procedure, personnel: that price is the disorganization that comes with any attempt to build too rapidly and in too piecemeal a fashion.

We have what is in essence a three-layered administrative structure. One layer may be called the pre-New Deal agencies and departmental bureaus. The second is the New Deal layer, consisting mainly of extra-departmental "independent" agencies and commissions. The third is a war layer, consisting of those agencies that have been set up for specific war-emergency tasks. What a post-war economy means, in the end, is the creation of a fourth administrative layer—a post-war layer—made up partly of the earlier agencies and personnel, reorganized and reoriented, and partly of new agencies and personnel.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It should be mentioned that, of all the aspects of the American Charter dealt with in this supplement, the NRPB report gives the least amount of explicit attention to the subject of administration. It deals with it in very general terms in the Introduction and there are brief passages on it in the sections on Urban Development, Valley Development, Public Works. The section of the report that deals most thoroughly and intelligently with the problems of administration is that on Social Security, prepared by Mrs. Eveline M. Burns. Nevertheless, by piecing together hints and suggestions throughout the report, a certain pattern emerges of problems to be met and ways of meeting them.

Presumably no new types of agency need to be created. In its section on Promotion of Free Enterprise the NRPB suggests a preference for the "mixed corporation" in dealing both with economic demobilization and with economic expansion. It cites the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, the Federal Home Loan Banks, the Federal Reserve Banks, and the role that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation plays in enterprises where it has obtained a stake in control through its loans, as instances of the mixed corporation. And it suggests three types of industrial situation in which the same technique can be applied in the post-war economy. One is in those industries crucial to war, in which the government already has a large investment: aluminum, magnesium, synthetic rubber, chemicals, shipbuilding and aircraft building. The second is in new operating units in other industries, such as urban expansion, housing, terminal replanning, air transport, communications and electric power. And the third is in the patents and properties formerly belonging to enemy aliens, and in certain strategic domestic patents.

Even more important than the type of agency is the personnel of the agencies. The problem of administrative personnel is the problem of finding *expertise*, and of placing it in such a way that technical ability can be used without bringing out political bias and without destroying the innovating sense of the men.

To meet this problem the following must be done. First, the merit system must be extended. Second, a deliberate effort must be made to find men of expert capacities regardless of their color, religion or political beliefs. The merit system in itself can be narrow and stultifying, letting the real ability of people slip through the crevices. Third, government positions must be made attractive enough in pay and prestige to draw the best talent to them. Fourth, the work load must not be a prohibitive one.

The next broad problem is that of administrative procedures. Here the most crying needs are for coördination, uniformity and inter-agency coöperation. Coördination is needed in order to do away with the conflict of jurisdictions. This is especially true in the social-security agencies and in the various public-works agencies, but it applies in the other areas as well. Uniformity is essential largely because much of the federal program considered here will have to be carried through with the coöperation of state and local authorities, who get bewildered and infuriated by having to deal with every federal agency on its own terms and in a different way. And inter-agency coöperation is needed in those situations where separate agencies must be maintained because of the divergent nature of the problems to be dealt with, but where these agencies must keep in touch with one another to avoid confusion.

Finally, there are administrative problems of budgeting, of congressional supervision, of public information. In the case of the public-works program, for example, appropriations must be made in time for the construction season, instead of being staggered over the whole year or delayed until the end of the fiscal year. Moreover, the entire construction program, as the NRPB recommends, must be presented to Congress and considered by it as a unit, so that the various items shall have meaning in relation to one another. And we have found from our war-economy experience that unless the public is kept well informed and continually informed about what the administrative agencies are doing, a hostile Congress or press can play havoc with them.

There remains the broad problem of bureaucracy and its controls. The cry of "bureaucracy" has already, of course, been raised against the American Charter, and will continue to be raised. It is one of the besetting evils of an irresponsible press and a partisan-minded Congress that all advances in the administrative arts must be made under the hail of the most virulent abuse. In one sense, of course, bureaucracy is inseparable from administration of any sort, whether in government, business, trade unions, churches or colleges. In another sense—the sense of rigidity, red tape, delay, unwillingness to take responsibility, absorption of the ends in the means—it must be avoided wherever possible, and fought wherever it crops up.

The best solution that has thus far been found in recent American administrative experience is that of the TVA plan, which combines centralization of power and authority with decentralization of administrative execution. This is a pattern which may well prove one of the creative ideas in American government, and which can be increasingly applied to the problems of a post-war administrative structure. In some areas, however—particularly in the social-security program—the great need is for centralization.

Two other ideas are worth our attention. One is the importance of controlling the controllers. Obviously the group that James Burnham has called the "managers" will take increasing power to themselves as the tasks of the state grow more and more technical. In this sense we are fortunate in America that we have a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tradition of democratic controls into which to build the new administrative structure. These controls are partly those of judicial review and due process; partly those of the control by the people of the selection of a President and a Congress, upon whom the entire administrative system depends.

But there is another sense in which the administrative process can remain democratic without ceasing to be technically efficient. We refer not to democratic controls but to democratic participation. As we have said, the people must be kept well informed as to what is going on. Their criticism must be sought not alone in the press and in Congress, but through the creation of local advisory groups which will bring local "grass-roots" experience to bear on the broad administrative problems. And finally, as the NRPB report suggests, there should be citizen representation on appeal agencies, wherever these are created.

Conclusion: We Can Win the Future

THE OUTLINES FOR an American Charter that have been drawn in the NRPB report are not the last word in planning. Except as regards the social-security program, they have not been reduced to detail, nor developed to anything like the blueprint stage. They are, in essence, marching orders. They give the general objectives, the main lines of direction, the strategy to be used. But there will be many contingencies along the way which we shall have to meet in a more detailed fashion when they arise.

That does not mean that they can be dismissed as vague rhetoric or wishful thinking. There will be many people who will want to do exactly that, because they will fear the effects upon their entrenched position of privilege from a mighty people that has taken into its own hands the provisions of jobs and social security. The fact is that the program is concrete enough for discussion on its broad merits, concrete enough for action in the form of a popular mandate.

That mandate will, if it comes at all, in all probability come as the result of the 1944 elections. They will be the watershed at which all the important streams of thought and striving from the past several decades divide and flow into the future. If the American people can organize the period of peace that they have won and make it an enduring peace, if they can apply the techniques of firmness and decisiveness used during the war to the organization of a post-war economy, if they can meet the basic aspirations of the returning soldiers and the demobilized war-workers, if they can make health and education and better housing more accessible than they have ever been, then they will have a right to feel that they have not only won the war but the future as well.

Obviously this task cannot be accomplished by focusing only on the internal American situation. We have learned through bitter experience that there is an organic relation both in war and peace between foreign and domestic policy. If we do not take steps immediately to extend the structure of the United Nations and make it into an effective economic, jural, administrative and military mechanism for settling international problems and enforcing peace, we shall find that the interval of peace we have snatched from the jaws of war is too brief to admit of our carrying through any plans of domestic reform. But the converse is also true: that plans for international order will have very little meaning if the crucial nation of the whole world once more abandons its people to the chaotic forces of planlessness and the ruthlessness of corporate power.

The three aims of the sort of world we are trying to build are, as the report puts it, democracy, dynamic economy, an organization for peace. "Never in the history of mankind have these three factors been united in a political system. . . . This is a novel combination never before attempted as a whole, although tried in part, nor ever before possible in man's history until the present time."

"America is promises," Archibald MacLeish has said. We have it in our power now to convert those promises into fulfilment. We have at our disposal all the material for such fulfilment. We know the techniques. It is no longer a question of ignorance or bewilderment. It has become quite simply a question of will and purpose and good faith.

For the American Charter will prove to be, in the end, a test of good faith. The degraded and impoverished of our country, the disinherited and despised, have responded to the call to fight in a war for freedom and for a better world. They, and also those better off who nevertheless care about maintaining a decent America and avoiding social violence, now have a right to demand that they be given the chance to prove that call to arms genuine.

If we miss this chance, we may not get another until the next Great Depression and the next World War. And this time the depression may not escape social violence. And this time the war may prove to be a War of Annihilation.

BRUCE BLIVEN, MAX LERNER, GEORGE SOULE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED